THE CHURCHMAN.

VOLUME XV.—No. 4. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 TIM. III. 15. WHOLE NUMBER 732.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETORS. NEW-YORK: SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1845. BY JAMES A. SPARKS, 161 FULTON-ST. } TERMS—$3 00 PER ANNUM—IN ADVANCE.

For the Churchman.

Midnight Vigils.

"In the dead of night, when no sound was heard and all nature was sleeping around, here and there, from the door of each cell, a light began to twinkle and presently, when each light appeared, the voice of prayer began to rise, solemn and slow."—*Southgate's Visit to the Syrian Church.*

The hallowed matin hour is gone,
In its fresh dewy prime,—
And hushed the voice of early prayer,
In joyous morning time.
The plaintive vespers have been sung,
E'en while the sunset ray
From convent wall, and tree, did pass
All silently away.

And in St. Mary's chapel, lone,
Where rest the sainted dead,
Der Zafran's monks, in chastened strains,
The Compline, too, have said;
While gathered 'round their fathers' tombs,
Near those they loved so well,
Like mournful requiem o'er the lost,
Upon the ear it fell!

It is the quiet midnight hour,
When darkling shadows creep—
And earthly cares and toils are still—
And wearied spirits sleep;—
And now from each sequestered cell,
A deep and fervent air
Riseth all solemnly and slow—
The monks are knelt in prayer!

Oh list ye prayerless ones—and ye
Who may not watch and pray,
If but an hour of night ye need
From sleep to steal away—
Tread lightly near those gloomy cells,
List to that hallowed chime—
The lonely Syrians' voice of prayer,
At solemn midnight time!—

Pierrepont Manor, March 15. M. S. B.

Communications.

For the Churchman.

Discipline—No. 1.

"The sum of the whole then is this,—Discipline is the great want of the Church at the present day. And the first step towards discipline is faith. We want discipline because we have not faith. We are not worthy to exercise discipline without. Without faith discipline is like the armor of the giant Saul upon the stripling David—it hampered without protecting him—the wearer was unprepared to use it. With faith discipline will be like the sword of Goliah in the hands of the man David, 'no weapon like it.' Let those of us who long for discipline pray for faith for ourselves, and endeavor to inspire it into our brethren by teaching and example. Then when the Church is prepared for discipline, discipline will come. Until then canons cannot bring it, conventions cannot bring it, lamentations over the want of it cannot bring it. Let every man who desires discipline examine his own heart whether he is as willing to submit to it himself as to enforce it upon others. If he finds that he is so, let him thank God that a step has been gained towards the establishment of discipline."

The above extract, Mr. Editor, is the concluding paragraph of a small but very excellent article upon discipline in the December number of the True Catholic. It is written it seems by a layman, and we take it to be a fair representation of the feelings upon this subject of a large proportion of our pious laity who understand the Church.

They know that by the very conditions of her existence the Church should be the "Holy Church," and that holiness should be an immediate result of her organization, a direct consequence of her practical working upon the minds of her children. They are convinced that the Church has "spiritual authority," and that this authority should issue forth in "a spiritual law," the effect of which should be discipline—a discipline not only seconding and following the voice of public opinion, but also directly going to produce a holiness and saintliness of character which neither public opinion nor the religion of the sects can originate. And therefore they look anxiously for such a discipline—they feel it to be one of the vital wants of the Church.

But besides this they feel that no alien element should be introduced into the Church even for the purpose of effecting this object; they are well convinced that neither the fervor of sectarian piety, nor the ardent spirit of sectarian zeal, nor the enthusiastic irregularity of sectarian measures can advantageously be introduced among us. All that we do must be consistent with our principles and our practice. All our improvements must spring from the Church—all of them be only the practical application to life and action of principles which we already hold. From the sects, or from any application of their principles to our necessities we can obtain only confusion and dissension. Upon this we believe the minds of our laity are made up.

And a still greater advance than this they have made. They feel that all arrangements merely economical, conventions, canons, and legislative action, are of no avail towards supplying the want of discipline, that the remedy lies something deeper; that there is something the want of which renders legislation idle and a mockery, the supply of which will give to formal legislation its substance, will render it effectual and authoritative.

Here then is a want felt and clearly acknowledged; a conviction equally strong that from such and such quarters its supply cannot come. How shall the want be satisfied and discipline established? In what direction shall we move and what means shall we take? This they know not. The want is pressing, the evil is deeply felt, but they have little sense of the quarter from which the remedy is to come, only they have the certain and assured faith that it will come, and that from certain quarters it cannot come.

As an illustration of this uncertainty, let us view in the above extract the wide and vague recommendation "to have faith," a recommendation which, if I considered that the main necessity of the Church at the present day was the restoration to action of the inherent miraculous powers of the Church, would be as efficient towards the restoration of that gift as of discipline! Consider the advice to examine ourselves individually as to whether "we would submit to discipline" when the very idea of discipline supposes a power that is able to compel the submission of the *private will* to *law!* Consider the appeal to individual faith for that which can never come from individual faith, but must come from the Church. In fact, when we come to the question, "How shall discipline be established?" this is the temper of the laity; a blind sensation of the want of it, a craving feeling and vague searching after it, a sincere conviction of its absolute necessity and almost a despair of attaining to it, and then as a consolation a trusting to individual faith for that which it never can give.

This is not our conclusion upon the point. We say that Holy Church has by the very fact of her existence and organization the means of supplying the spiritual wants of her children; and that never from the individual can come that which God intends to come from the Church. And we say, too, that this very want can be supplied from the practical action of our laity themselves in a particular direction.

Now let us consider the causes that favor the introduction of discipline, as also the obstacles that stand in its way. The first are all of them embraced in the fact that "we are the Church." This produces the feeling that we should be holy—a feeling of the necessity and being of a spiritual law—a feeling that the Church is still dependent when she barely executes the sentence which "the opinion of the world" called "public opinion" has pronounced. All our doctrines, all our principles go to create in the minds of those that truly realize them the demand for a discipline that shall enforce them upon the minds of all her children. These are the circumstances that produce the demand for it.

Now let us look at the obstacles. The first is the prejudice created against discipline by the action of a system under that name in the sects around us. From their knowledge of its workings the very name of discipline is hateful. Every one who has any knowledge of this sect-discipline knows well the odiousness, the unfairness, the insufficiency, of that miscalled discipline. Ask the mass of our communicants and of our clergy, even those that the most desire a discipline, shall we have the discipline of the sects, or one founded upon the same plan established among us? and at once they will say, "No, we do not want it,—we will not have it,—we will not endure it,—better far remain as we are than have such a discipline as that is."

For ourselves we perfectly coincide with this opinion, as we believe every Churchman will who knows any thing of the workings of the sectarian discipline—a discipline which in fact denies the existence of any "spiritual law," and therefore is forced to base itself wholly upon the maxims and practice of the criminal law; and when this fails, as fail it must when applied to ecclesiastical matters, then props itself up with the despotic and absolute opinion of the strongest-headed and most influential man in the society—this is not a discipline for the Church. Neither this nor its miserable supplement, "the covenant," as it is called, "of mutual supervision," by which each member is bound to watch over every other, a ready plan by which the spiteful, the censorious, the busybody, the tattler, are authorized and empowered to spy out their neighbor's faults and comment upon them. We want none of these things. We desire neither the jangling, disturbance, and confusion of the Congregationalist trials, nor the despotic authorities of the Methodist circuit-rider with his book in his hand. We will rather go without any more discipline than we have than have such things as these are. Rather will we be content with the weekly training of our liturgy which, from its responsive form, is in fact a "doctrinal discipline;" rather rest content with the personal influence and weight of character of our clergy and their authority to remove offenders from the communion, exercised secretly and quietly, than have the discipline of the sects or any thing resembling it established among us. This, I believe, is the unanimous sentiment both of clergy and laity. Still, however, we believe that one effect of that discipline which exists around us is to associate the very word with ideas drawn from that sect discipline, to render the very name odious, and so to put an obstacle in the way of *any discipline*. We have done well enough with what we have, say they, why should we not continue to do so?

So long as we were merely a respectable sect of Church-of-England men we did well enough; but now we feel and know that *we are not a sect but the Church*, and our circumstances, as well adverse as fortunate, give us no small guarantee of the truth of that opinion. Some government, then, we require and must have as 'the Church' for all men and all classes of men, which we did not need when we looked upon ourselves and were looked upon by others as a denomination peculiarly fitted for the upper classes of society only. The spirit of the Church is upon us now; and more than this the spirit of the 'Holy Church.' The very fact of our standing forth as "the Church" implies holiness. It implies a spiritual law, and the Church the bearer of that spiritual law, and this law working perpetually upon her members *consciously* and *unconsciously* towards holiness. In vain, therefore, shall we attempt to remain as we are; the very being of the Church goes to create the demand for "discipline," for the putting forth in an express form of that spiritual authority wherewith the Church is vested. It must be done, and *if not in peace* it will *in confusion and trouble put itself forth.*

I have shown one of the obstacles to its introduction. Let us now consider what is the difference between the sects in this matter and the Church, and we shall see very strong reasons for our abhorrence of the sectarian discipline. In their opinion all Churches are merely voluntary societies. Hence it is by the will of the society that members are admitted or that they are expelled; the officers of the particular society are only agents of its will. Upon this theory it will at once be seen that "societies" are in fact neither more nor less than *religious clubs*, the covenant of the society answers to the constitution of the club; the advantages are the advantages of a club; the only sense of union upon which the members rest is the club-feeling; casting out of a member is the same as in a club, for breaking the covenant or constitution. Of course it is a club for the very highest and purest purpose, but still to all intents and purposes a club. Hence their discipline.

Now let us look at our theory. God established a Church universal and holy, the *Body of His dear Son;* to be cast out from it is to be cast out from the *body of Christ*, to lose its advantages is not merely to lose the advantages of the particular congregation, society, or club, but to be cast out from Christ and salvation. And as the instrument of that union with the body of Christ he has given us the sacrament wherein Christ is really present with the faithful receiver. To be rejected from the communion of Christ's body and blood is to be cast out from the Holy Catholic Church as far as loss of privileges goes; in fact this is the meaning of the word excommunication and expulsion from *the communion of Christ's body and blood.* Our principles, then, as regards the advantages lost are wholly different from those of the dissenters; and any discipline introduced among us must be consistent with our principles, not theirs. Nor do our principles upon the point of the authority to exercise the power differ less than those upon the nature of the privileges. They hold that it is the will of the society that excommunicates—the will of the individual society. We, that this power is given to the officer *by* the Holy Catholic Church and *in it*, and that for it he is not dependant upon the congregation in which he may minister, nor responsible to it, but to the Church. In fact, to every clergyman upon his ordination as priest is given the authoritative power of the lesser excommunication, of repelling from the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. We have the power by the very terms of our ordination.

"Why then," some one will say, "have we so little discipline? The clergy have the authority, the exertion of which is discipline; they can exert it; let them go on and we shall have a discipline; they will be sustained in it, or if not they will have the satisfaction of doing their duty." This I believe is all true.

And yet when any one is commissioned to exercise judicial authority there are along with the authority two conditions usually given which render it possible, and without which that judicial authority cannot be exercised. *We have not these conditions.*

However, I shall illustrate this assertion by a circumstance appropriate to the matter in hand, which, upon the best authority, I know to be true. In a country parish in the north of Ireland, the curate of the parish was conversing with a friend; that friend incidentally asked of him "whether a certain Mr. M. was a communicant? The curate answered that he was so, a most constant and regular attendant. His friend then adverted to the fact that the man was "an open and notorious evil liver. In fact, twenty years before he had taken away the wife of his servant, and for all that time continued to live with her as if she were his wife, the husband still remaining a servant in his house! And this man was a constant and regular communicant! The answer of the curate was that he often had spoken to the man in private, had set before him the grievousness of his sin and his utter unfitness, but the man still persisted in coming." "Why did he not then openly repel him according to the rubric?" "He had a widowed mother and three sisters to support out of a salary of 70 pounds (350 dollars) a year. If he publicly repelled the man he would have an action against him and recover damages. A case of the same kind had happened within ten miles, in which five hundred pounds damages had been given against a curate, *although the wickedness of the man was clearly proved upon the trial.* He could not subject himself to this when he considered the misery he must thereby inflict upon his mother and sisters."

"Let him go on," almost every one will say at first thought, "let him go on and do his duty at all risks, and not permit such a man to profane the table of the Lord." Such would be the first thoughts of almost every pious and true feeling man. And yet of those who would so strenuously insist upon this line of conduct we may say safely not one in ten thousand would act up to his own advice in precisely the same circumstances. And in the majority I believe the second thought would be pity for the clergyman, and a sad acquiescence in the necessity of the case.

For ourselves, we say that if he acted he would have deserved the praise of a hero and a martyr, and of sacrificing himself to the purity of the Church and the vindication of her law and authority. Still we say, that when judicial authority is given to any one, it is not given alone—two things are given with it which render its execution possible. The first is, that "the judge is absolutely and entirely secured against the malice and revenge of the criminal upon whom he has passed sentence."—Of this immunity the State assures every officer of justice from the judge down to the constable. This the Church of England had not given to the clergyman when it gave him the power to repel from the communion. It had rather ensured the contrary by means of the civil law which said, "So far from ensuring you from this man's revenge if you execute the ecclesiastical law upon him, I shall help him to his vengeance and be an agent of it."

The second is, that the judge decide by a law acknowledged by every individual necessarily and universally. For instance, murder or theft in civilized nations is acknowledged to be a crime by every one, even by the murderer or the thief. Neither State nor Church had in this case given the clergyman this guarantee of universal necessary opinion. The State by a long course of action had taught her subjects that the communion is a civil privilege and nothing else. Hence the man did not feel or know the law under which he was to be punished and acted upon so.

The authority to act judicially, therefore, was given without the conditions that render action possible; and however I might praise his heroism and self-sacrifice if he acted without these conditions, still the man I think was justified. Of course the circumstances of European society are to be taken into account and the state of the public opinion there. Every one admits such a case could not have occurred here.

And why? Is it that the Church gives her clergy these two requisites? Not a whit. But public opinion, a power external to the Church, the opinion of the world in such cases gives these conditions. It is sufficiently instructed to know and declare that such a man is not suited to approach the Lord's table, and sufficiently authoritative to guarantee the clergyman in his action. The Church, then, does not give these requisites when she gives authority. She gives it to him and leaves him to seek the conditions of being able to exercise it where he can find them. Let him step a hair's breadth beyond public opinion, or be a whit more rigorous in his estimation of morality, and though he have the Scriptures, the Faith and the Church at his back, we shall find, for want of these conditions he cannot proceed. Now this is placed at the bottom, and the first question towards the establishment of discipline is, "Can the Church give these conditions, and how can she give them?" W. A.

For the Churchman.

Trial of Bishops.

NO. II.

Mr. Editor,—A few weeks since I sent you some reflections upon the unjust operation of our present canon for the trial of Bishops, occasioned by the omission of the right of the accused to challenge or object to such of his triers as he might deem to be so prejudiced or set against him as to be incapable of administering justice in the premises. Further thought has confirmed me in the view then adopted. It has also satisfied me that there are many other reasons why the canon should be repealed. It is next to impossible that any one tried according to its provisions, can be favored with an equitable decision on his case. I hope to make this apparent at various times, as my leisure shall serve.

At present I mean to occupy your attention with the injustice of not fixing some limitation as to the ages of the accusations upon which specifications may be founded.

Secular tribunals have the advantage of being guided by laws based upon the experience and practice of centuries, and framed by persons whose whole business is to be concerned in the administration of justice. However faulty these enactments may be in their details, in their main or governing features, they are almost always right. It is remarkable that they seldom are at variance with the law of God; and equally remarkable that like all the provisions of His code, they aim at tempering their stern severity with as much of mercy as is possible consistently with the maintenance of justice. Hence their statutes of limitation. The history of criminal proceedings has shown that for the due protection of the accused party, it is absolutely necessary that he be not placed on trial for acts so deeply buried in the past that they have no chance of a righteous investigation. The law of the land therefore declares that, unless in certain cases necessarily constituting exceptions, no one shall be arraigned for any offence of a certain specified age. It deems the absence of public accusation during the intermediate time, a proof of innocence.

Now do not wisdom, justice, and mercy require a similar provision in ecclesiastical law? Cannot we of the Church profit by the experience of other ages and the history of legal practice, as well as men of the world? Ought not we as much as they to respect the difficulties in the way of making a true and proper examination of conduct assigned to a period long gone by? Ought not their example to deter us from attempting to administer justice to an accused person when the lapse of years has rendered his clear defence almost an impossibility? And if they, governed in the main by considerations of only worldly prudence, under such circumstances, have respect to mercy, should not we who depend for salvation wholly upon the mercy of God, extend the like kind consideration when one of our brethren, nay, one of our spiritual Fathers is alleged to have erred?

I maintain that in such a matter we are positively bound to be taught by the enactments which civilians have deduced from alike the necessity of the case, their own extensive practice and observation, and their well-directed and faithful studies. Canon III. of 1844 ought therefore never to have been passed in its present shape. It was due to the righteousness which exalteth a church as much as it does a nation, that the General Convention, notwithstanding the large amount of business before it, should not have hurried over this grave and immensely important measure without careful consideration of every one of its features. If such consideration had been vouchsafed it, would it not certainly have been modified by at least the insertion of the right of the accused to challenge the prejudiced portion of his triers, and a clause declaring that no accusation founded upon an alleged act of, for example, more than three years old, should be entertained? It must have been that the exciting topics before the Convention diverted the attention of the members from the careful scrutiny of many measures of importance. Upon no other supposition can we account for the omission of essential features in this canon by so many tried and careful men. If it had not been for some such interferring cause, the very respectable and leading portion of the House of Clerical and Lay Delegates must have perceived how much less equitable was the law they were passing than those which their profession gave them occasion constantly to examine.

A single application of the canon has been sufficient to manifest its great injustice; and it is now as certain as any thing in the future can be, that three years will not transpire before it is altered. In the mean time, if another trial of a Bishop becomes necessary, his fellows in the Episcopate will be careful not to be judge and jury in the case if they fear they are influenced in the least by prejudice or any like cause, and great caution will be observed how antiquated charges are entertained. Experience is a good though sometimes a painful instructer.

Even if we did not possess the light and benefit of secular action on this subject, we could discover for ourselves that limitations are indispensable. Indeed we *have* made the discovery: for in admitting a person into either the diaconate or the priesthood, we do not authorize reference to the character of his life further back than the period of three years. No matter what may have been his previous career, if he has lived godly, piously and soberly for the three preceding years, and his attainment be sufficient, he is ordained. Now what is this but a statute of limitation? And if the principle be a good one, why is it not carried out in all kindred portions of ecclesiastical law?

The lapse of many years should be a bar to any accusation, because it renders it difficult to produce the counteracting testimony.

There is the difficulty occasioned by forgetfulness; and this, every body knows, is increased with the progress of time. The accused is quite as liable to forget as any body else. And hence when he is put upon his trial for conduct which transpired say eight or ten years ago, circumstances which are positively necessary for his defence have escaped him altogether. Had the charge been no more than three years old, he might have recollected that such or such qualifying or explanatory incidents occurred at the instant specified in the allegation; or that certain persons were present and witnessed the transaction. But add on five or seven years crowded with important and exciting events, and you diminish incalculably his chance of remembering. In such a case he is reduced, most probably, to the necessity of deducing the explanatory or extenuating occurrences from the statement of the accusing party. He is therefore at great disadvantage; for his enemy is very sure not to remember more than will suit his own purpose.

Let us suppose the accusation is supported by the testimony of one who is *not* intent upon swearing to only a part of the truth. The witness is of a peculiar temperament. She is, if you please, a lady. She is of a suspicious and imaginative turn. The accused in a free and confiding and yet innocent intercourse makes demonstrations of affectionate parental regard, which her predisposition of mind leads her first to believe to be insulting and then, with the aid of a very little of her active fancy, it is transformed into a gross and impure act. Thus in perhaps less than five minutes, is an impression indelibly fixed in her mind to the lasting injury of one who would not have harmed her for the world. The worst of it is that having determined that she is insulted, her distinguishing traits lead her to construe every other act of the supposed offender in her presence, in the light which agrees with her unfavorable assumption. In this way the very best evidence of his purity, i. e., his confiding and familiar cheerfulness, is taken as proof of some unchristian design. He is unaware of the impression he has made. Years roll around. Almost every circumstance of the interview passes from his mind. Most of them pass from her mind also; but for a very different reason. Her attention was first riveted upon one point—an imaginary insulting act. As often as she recurs to the scene, that one act and the incidents supposed to corroborate her construction of it, are reviewed. They monopolise her thoughts to the exclusion of many particulars which calmer and, I will not say more candid, but, more matter-of-fact minds would interpret as decidedly against every shade of her impression. As time passes away, as is the nature of such convictions, her impression is strengthened and her forgetfulness of the qualifying or explanatory incidents more complete. And now, after the lapse of a number of years, she comes forward and with the intent to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, she *gives as facts the conclusions which her temperament and habit of mind led her to adopt.*

The accused remembers very little of the circumstances. The most he knows is that he is entirely guiltless of the act and the motive imputed to him. In his forgetfulness he is obliged to rely mainly on the lady herself. So he proceeds to question her. He is persuaded that at the interview, certain things must have transpired, and if he can make these appear he clears himself from the foul imputation. He frames his interrogatories accordingly. But it is of no use. The circumstances seem to the witness too small to need recollection. They made no impression upon her mind. *It is so long since that really she ought not to be presumed to recollect.* So the arraigned party is condemned upon the carefully nourished erroneous impressions of the lady—impressions made only the stronger because her imagination has been busy with them so many years—when if her testimony could have been taken at a much earlier period, he would have been exonerated by the incidents she now forgets. In other words, the witness who at an earlier day would inevitably have saved him by her declarations, now occasions his destruction. Should there not be a statute of limitation to prevent such injustice as this?

Let it not be thought that I am compelled to resort to an improbable case to make good my argument against the existing canon. The recent trial exhibits a case enough like it to justify all its particulars. Mrs. Butler's own testimony is far from proving her either unsuspicious or unimaginative. She remembers with great distinctness, an insult respecting which Mr. Peck, (a man according to her own testimony, on the look out for inconsistencies in religious persons,) though riding in the same carriage, did not have so much as a suspicion; an insult of which a doating as well as an observing husband turning continually towards the parties and conversing with them, saw not the shadow of evidence. But she does not remember other things which, because of their bearing on the case, it was important to bring out. We have her convictions in as strong terms as they could be conveyed, and in as aggravated a coloring as either truth or fancy could present them: but we have only a little which tends to prove that her impressions were caused by exaggerated feeling and unkind suspicions;—only a little to show what we have since ascertained by the representations of Mr. Peck, that the offensive acts were simply a misconstrued attempt to soothe a young friend with whom the accused had long been very intimate, and who was suffering from indisposition. It is useless to trace out her testimony. It is enough to say that by the joint operation of her temperament and mental habit and the lapse of time she remembers one set of circumstances with wonderful minuteness, and of another set she has an equally wonderful oblivion. In justice and in charity to her we must believe that had she testified at an earlier day—a day near the occurrences of which she speaks—her evidence would have been different in many respects.

The cases of the Misses Rudderow are also in point. It is proved that after the affronts which they assert they received, they gave the offender several unequivocal tokens of cordiality and regard. Of these however they have themselves very little recollection. They remember the circumstances which militate against the accused; but they do not remember the conduct which is in perfect contradiction of the notion that they had been affronted in the way represented. Several years had transpired. In the mean time they had thought much and talked much respecting the alleged insult. Sooner or later their impressions took a definite form. All their subsequent thoughts and conversations concerning them, helped to give them permanency. Not so however with the facts which had a corrective tendency. From these their minds were diverted—turned away—and therefore they were very slightly remembered. Had the trial been held sooner these witnesses would not have had so much time to forget, and their testimony while it would have been more consistent with itself, would have had a more righteous bearing.

Even the case of Mrs. Beare, though it occurred only about two and a half years previous to the trial, likewise affords us an example. It was important to the Respondent to prove that her conduct was inconsistent with impressions which she adopted after the manner in which it is supposed Mrs. Butler adopted hers. Several other witnesses—persons of the highest standing for intelligence and veracity—testify that she and her husband manifested great cordiality towards the alleged offender, a cordiality that extends so far as even to press and urge him to dine with them. And although Mrs. Franklin testifies that Mr. B. pertinaciously refused to relinquish his claim to the guest when she pressed her prior right, neither he nor his lady can recollect such particulars. Again then, in charity, are we driven to charge this forgetfulness to the lapse of time. We must believe that had Mrs. B. been examined only as much as a year sooner, her answers would have been different; even as we are bound to think that in some way inscrutable to us, she can reconcile her declarations respecting a certain memorandum—first, *It is destroyed;* and afterwards, *It is not destroyed.* If only two and a half years lead to such discrepancy, surely we do not wrong in asking that evidence older than three or four years be not allowed.

Going then no farther than this singular and most mortifying trial, we have abundance of proof that a statute of limitation is necessary, because when occurrences date far back the forgetfulness of both the accused party and the witnesses prevents strict justice. It is not necessary to impugn the motives of any one. I take the imperfection of human memory as a fact; and I take as an additional fact, that by the progress of time and various influences which are ever at work, the impressions of the most veracious are capable of undergoing a substantial revolution. They may retain the form or outline which they had at first, and yet be of a virtually different character: just as many a man retains the same leading mental characteristics he had in his purer days, when familiarity with vice has debased him. His acquaintances know him to be the same person, and yet his influence on the morals of society is totally the reverse of what it had been.

The length to which I have drawn out this communication, Mr. Editor, renders it proper for me not to trouble you now with any more of my reflections. I would have you understand, however, that I have still other reasons to urge why our canon for the trial of Bishops should be altered so as to secure to the accused in addition to the right of challenging his triers, the benefit of a statute of limitation. I would not have justice defeated in any case. It is for justice I plead. I endeavor to show that secular law founded upon the practice and experience of centuries, makes a limitation necessary to serve the ends of a righteous equity; and I argue that the considerations which weigh with the wise men of the world in this matter, should have equal weight with the legislators of the Church. I have advanced the imperfection of memory as one of the reasons why we should follow the good and merciful provision of civil tribunals; and, with your permission, it will not be long before I endeavor to add to it others equally strong and imperative.

UNUS.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—I have seen a paper headed "Bishop Onderdonk's Case," and subscribed "An Episcopalian." There are several points, on which I differ with the author. On two, if you please, I would ask the favor of troubling you with a word.

He says: "The writer is one of those who is disposed to distrust the motives of some of the instigators of the prosecution in question; but the impeachment of the motives of such persons does not, since the trial and decision of the Court, prove the innocence of the Bishop."

This may be granted to be literally true. The motives of the instigators considered *per se*, prove nothing else than their own shame. I would, however, respectfully ask "An Episcopalian," whether such motives may not have *connections with*, and *relations to*, a prosecution, which require to be considered, in the formation of a *righteous judgment* of the case.

Take the case now in all our hearts. Evidence of the most impartial kind is before us, derived from both *pro* and *con*, and not contradicted I believe by either, that hostility to Bishop Onderdonk, growing out of his ordination of Mr. Carey, and of matters and things connected with that ordination, lay at the foundation of the late proceedings against him. *This* was the reason why he was to be put down, and, if possible, destroyed. *To aid in this*, memory is ransacked to discover, among its rubbish, something against him which will tell on the popular mind a little more powerfully than offences of a merely *official* nature. It is recollected that, without any effort at the Christian duty of explanation or reconciliation, certain stories of years gone by, have been whispered up and down to his injury. The whisperers and confidential gossips are sought out. They are told of a great crisis in the Church. They are reminded of what has been said by or of them. They are exhorted to be *true to the Church*, and not to hesitate to make good their former stories, that there may be sufficient ground for the removal of an obnoxious man. Surely, neither "An Episcopalian," nor any other sensible man, need be reminded how a fading or yielding memory may be thus brought into entire subjection to a *strong collateral purpose;* and therefore how this purpose may very naturally override an equitable decision, touching the "innocence" of the accused party. Show me bad motives influencing a prosecution, and I will show you a very natural cause of much that throws suspicion on the conduct of the prosecution.

In another place, the author takes the ground that the sentence is a revocable one: that the Court could not have meant to place the Bishop under permanent or hopeless disability to exercise the functions of his office, or they would not have *suspended* but *deposed* him. He may, therefore, be restored. The writer thinks, however, that this cannot be done, unless he acknowledge the justice of the verdict. Consequently, "if he feels that he is not guilty before God, and that he has been unjustly condemned," there is no hope for him. Now this, I think, is a hard sentence. No one believes in the infallibility of human tribunals. The whole system of appeals in judicial matters is built on the supposition that there may be error and injustice in human proceedings and decisions. On the principle of non-infallibility, this is true even of a Court of *last appeal*. In the present instance more than one third of the Court dissented from the verdict. So far the Bishop is sustained. I would put it to the head and heart of "An Episcopalian," and every other sensible and good man, whether the Bishop should be shut out from the benefit of the *reasonableness* of his sentence, because he cannot in conscience admit its justice. Suppose he quietly and humbly submits to it, and to the accumulated suffering which it brings upon him; and suppose his whole conduct is that of a penitent, devout, and faithful Christian, ought not this, on the principles that should govern the followers of Christ to entitle him to the same mercy which might be awarded to his acknowledgment of the justice of the sentence? A CHURCHMAN.

For the Churchman.

Sailors.

Mr. Editor,—Would that Episcopalians in all our seaports were aroused to do something for the religious welfare of this long neglected and most useful class of men. The debt we owe to sailors is very great, yet how little do we regard it. No wonder that our proverbial neglect of seamen should have called forth the pungent rebuke,

> "God and the sailor we adore
> In times of danger—not before;
> The danger o'er, both are alike requited,
> God is forgotten, and the sailor slighted."

Now is the time for action. Why should there not be a Seaman's Episcopal Chapel in every seaport, afloat or on shore, where our Churches abound? The sailor is pleased with our mode of worship. He likes the regularity and order of our services. In the navy the Episcopal service is almost universally used on board our public ships, and in case of a burial the Prayer-book is the only book thought of, whether in public ships or merchantmen, for a funeral service.

Now, I repeat it, is the time for action. There never was a moment more auspicious. Until within twenty months, Episcopalians for seventy years, as a Church, had done nothing for the religious instruction of sailors in the port of New York. A movement was first made here by the Young Men's Church Missionary Society, whose Board of Managers is composed of fifty zealous laborers, taken from every Episcopal congregation in the city. They have built a Floating Church, 70 feet by 30. It is a beautiful Gothic edifice, gracefully resting on the waters, on a wide deck erected on two boats of eighty tons each, ten feet apart. The enterprise works well.

Such an enterprise could but work well in Buffalo, on the Lakes, and in our principal ports along our sea-board; in Boston, Providence, New Haven, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Baltimore, Charleston, Savannah, Mobile and New Orleans. What great good might be done in this way!

Now is the time. There is a great moral change taking place among sailors, the fruits of what has already been done for them by other denominations. That vessels should go to sea without a sufficient quantity of spirituous liquors on board for daily allowance to every man, was formerly unheard of. Now there is often not a drop but in the medicine chest. Scarcely a new crew, formerly, ever came on board an outward bound vessel unless in a state of beastly intoxication, so that for the security of life owners were obliged to send their ships to sea by riggers, or keep them at anchor a day before sailing, as not a man was fit to be sent aloft. Now, we hear of no sailors *carted* down to the slip dead drunk and put on board in this state. How common was this not many years since.

Sailors now, are fond of attending public worship while on shore, and in a house appropriated to themselves. They are not always disposed to go where their red flannel shirt or clothing would render them conspicuous. It was not long since that I gave a sailor a tract called the *Sailor's Religion*. He read it. What was its influence? He began to talk about his mother. Said he, "I must go and see my mother. She used to talk with me about religion. I intended to go to sea immediately, but I will go and see my mother first. This Church of yours," said he, "alluding to the Floating Church, (of which I have the honor to be the minister) "is a good concern. It will do much good. I shall come here again after I have seen my mother." A thousand little incidents show that our whole marine are in a transition state, and are on the eve of a revival of evangelical religion. I see evidences of it every week in my labors among seamen in connexion with the Floating Church of our Saviour. Nearly two thousand different seamen and officers have attended there during the last year. Many on going to sea have asked for the prayers of the congregation worshipping there, anxious to be commended to God's gracious protection on the deep. On reaching port, some after dangerous shipwrecks. many others after a rough or a pleasant voyage, have come into God's sanctuary, and, by a note sent to me with their names, desired the congregation to join with them in publicly offering thanks to him for their merciful preservation. Some, on a discharge from the hospital; others, after recovery from sickness or other providential manifestation of God's sparing mercy, have expressed to me a desire to return to him the acknowledgments of a grateful heart in his Church. The disposition to attend public worship is also very much in advance of what it was formerly; and the circumstance to which I now purpose to allude is an indication that the *officers* as well as the crews of our ships are thinking more of their duties to God and the moral responsibilities of their station than they have ever done before.

Repeatedly, by request of captains bound on long voyages, I have accompanied them to sea on their leaving port, to return with the pilot. Within a few weeks,—twice in the midst of winter,—in fine weather I have been gratified by mingling in a scene on shipboard which must have affected many hearts, and confirms the truth of the observations above made.

Only ten days since, a fine new ship left the port of New York for a distant part of the globe. The captain came first to our Floating Church by my invitation, to himself and crew in person, on board his ship, just after his arrival. His ship was at the slip, brought in dismasted. I thought the occasion a suitable one to be improved, and went on board on purpose to drop some word for the cause of my divine Master. I was most kindly received. The captain and his crew were at Church that day, and returned thanks to Almighty God, in presence of the congregation, for his late merciful preserva- of their lives. The scene was an interesting and affecting one. Every succeeding Sunday, while he was in port I saw the captain and some of his crew at our Church. His vessel was refitted and destined to a distant part of the globe. The captain, on Sunday, the day before he sailed, sent me a note, asking for the prayers of the congregation for himself and crew. He was present in Church with them all when his and their names were read to the congregation. After the sermon in the afternoon he came to me, and placing ten dollars in my hands, requested I would procure him some Prayer-books and some other religious books for his crew, and suggested that it would gratify him if I should find it convenient to accompany him to Sandy Hook, and return with the pilot. I gladly consented. The next day, when nearly eight miles outside of Sandy Hook, and about to take my leave with the pilot, the captain told me it was his intention to have divine service on board every Sunday, and that he should himself officiate and use a part of our service, and read a sermon to his crew. He said he felt the responsibility of his position, and that although he was not as religious a man as he ought to be, he intended to turn over a new leaf. He then asked me if I would have any objection to offering a prayer to God for himself and men before leaving the ship. I most gladly complied. So particular was the captain that every man should be present at the after hatches, near the capstan, on which I leaned, that he made the pilot take the helm, to liberate the man at the wheel. The scene was such as would have affected the most insensible heart.

After the conclusion of a short address and prayer, each of the crew came up to take me by the hand and bid me farewell. I could see that there was more than the captain's eye in which stood a tear. Ten miles outside the Hook, after this interesting service, I left this beautiful ship under full sail. She was plunging with her bows into the rolling waves which swept her waists, and gallantly plowing her smooth furrow as she swiftly moved forward on the deep. We parted at no snail's pace for the city, and they for a port ten thousand miles away, and in an hour and a quarter only a small speck on the horizon showed us the course she had taken. It faded quickly as we gazed on it, but the memory of the scene on her deck is now as distinct and as vivid as in the first hour after I left her.

The last Sunday the number of persons bound to sea for whom prayers were offered, by request, at the Floating Church of our Saviour, that God would preserve them on the deep, amounted to more than twenty-eight. Their names were all read as sent to me in ten different notes. I thought little of the matter at the time as such a number was not unusual. After service in the afternoon, a female with deep anxiety depicted on her countenance, addressed me, to ask if in the morning I did not read the name of W. B. I carefully looked over the names and found it. "Sir," said she, "that is my brother. My mother and we all have wept for him these two years, as we heard the ship in which he sailed had foundered at sea. He left us three years ago. We have not heard a word from him since. To-day I heard his name was read among those who asked for prayers here, and I came to learn if it was really so. Oh, my mother's heart will be full when she hears he is alive. She lives in a town 70 miles from New York, and I have but recently come to this city to reside. He could not have known I was in the city, or he would have come to see me." The name of her brother's boarding house was given to this anxious sister, whose heart began now to burst with joy. Her brother had sailed only the day before for Liverpool. He could not be absent long; and his landlord—a religious man—I knew would pour all the oil and wine into the wounded heart of the mother and daughter, which was in his power.

As one of the consequences of the late improvement in the condition and habits of seamen, I here annex a list of the number of vessels and lives lost on our coast within the eight years which preceded the year 1844, and the number as far as ascertained in the year 1844. The difference is very remarkable, though twenty vessels are still missing, whose melancholy story it is to be feared will never be told:—

	No. of vessels lost.	No. of lives lost.
1836	316	826
1837	490	1295
1838	427	756
1839	442	537
1840	521	648
1841	380	602
1843	304	642
1844	208	105

On the lakes in 1844, thirty-nine vessels driven ashore, eighteen totally lost, and fifty-one lives lost.

B. C. C. PARKER,
Minister of the Floating Church of our Saviour for Seamen.

New York, March 18, 1845.

For the Churchman.

Tracts for the Seasons.

NO. X.

The apostles of our Lord were slow of heart to believe in His resurrection. This was especially true of St. Thomas. He insisted on sensible proof by testing the identity of his person. He must see and feel the wounds inflicted in His hands by the executioner's nails, and in His side by the soldier's spear. Jesus indulged him in this. In the thoroughness of conviction, and the impulse of intelligent and honest feeling, he exclaimed, "My Lord and my God!"

This unequivocal attributing of divinity to his Master was the necessary result of a full belief in His resurrection—the point proposed for present consideration.

Resurrection from the dead is incontestible proof of divine interposition.

When it takes place after having been appealed to as evidence in favor of claims to extraordinary excellence and dignity of character, it must be regarded as manifesting the divine sanction of those claims.

Jesus Christ rose from the dead.

Jesus Christ had previously advanced claims to divinity, and foretold His resurrection as a part of the evidence of the justice of those claims.

Therefore the sanction of Heaven is given to those claims, and Jesus Christ is indeed our Lord and our God.

Resurrection from the dead is incontestible proof of divine interposition.

This amounts so nearly to a self-evident proposition that it seems unnecessary to enter on the proof of it. To whatever extent scepticism may go in endeavoring to avert the consequences of other miracles, it must stop when it arrives at this. However a biassed imagination may conceive of dexterous ingenuity, or studied arts of fraud, as the real source of alleged miracles, when men are evidently the agents, it cannot thus account for the restoration of life. When death's cold hand has been laid upon his victim, and he is seen prostrate under his stroke, senseless, motionless, lifeless, and laid in the close tomb, where, if any spark of life remained, it must be extinguished, no prejudice or incredulity, that of atheism, can think of that victim being released by any power but that which first gave him being. Restoration to life can be no otherwise viewed than as pointing directly to divine interposition.

Therefore, when a person foretells his resurrection, and appeals to it as evidence in favor of claims to extraordinary excellence and dignity of character, it must, if it take place, be regarded as manifesting the divine sanction of those claims.

Of course, reference is here made, not to the general resurrection, when all who are in their graves shall come forth; but to that marked and special interposition of Providence, which signalizes an individual by enabling him, ere others awake from the sleep of death, to rise and revisit the earth.

When this event, so utterly removed from human possibility, is foretold and appealed to, and when claims to extraordinary dignity and excellence of character, and to the peculiar favor of Heaven, look to it for their justification; to suppose that it would be suffered to transpire, and this deliberate appeal to God be favorably answered, and yet that these claims are unfounded, hostile to truth, and therefore necessarily displeasing to God, were a profane and blasphemous insult to His character. And especially when claims to divinity are those in support of which resurrection from the dead is deliberately anticipated, and confidently foretold, it is utterly impossible that this incontestible act of divine power would be granted, if these claims are the blasphemous pretensions of a mere creature.

To apply these general principles, we assert that Jesus Christ rose from the dead.

Of this, the evidence afforded in the New Testament is amply sufficient in its connection with the fact, resting on extraneous proof, strong as can be brought for any past event, that this evidence was publicly advanced at the time, and in the place, which it assigned to his resurrection.

And what is this evidence?

It is publicly declared that Jesus Christ was arraigned as a blasphemer and impostor, as inimical to the religion of the Jews, and to the Roman government, under which they then lived; that He was closely examined by the Roman governor, and subjected by him to a trial in the presence of many witnesses; that He was brought forth as an object of mockery and derision to the populace; that in their presence, after having been cruelly scourged, He was led to the place of execution and crucified; that after His death He was, by permission of the civil authority, they being satisfied by examination of His person that he was really dead, taken from the cross and interred; that His tomb was watched by a military guard, stationed there by order of the governor; that terrified by a great earthquake, and by the appearance of an angel from heaven, who rolled the stone from the mouth of the sepulchre, these guards were panic-struck, and fled; that from the tomb thus supernaturally thrown open, He that was dead arose; that the watch were bribed to say that the disciples had stolen His body while they slept; that He was seen by His disciples and followers at various times after His resurrection, and on one occasion by more than five hundred, conversed with them, ate with them, and gave every proof of the reality of His resurrection; and that after forty days He ascended, in their sight, into heaven.

All this the disciples of Jesus confidently asserted at the very time and place in which they declared the several events had transpired. It is evident that the most material of them were of so public a nature, and consequently so fully open to investigation, that they would hardly have ventured to assert them on false grounds; for the deception might have been immediately exposed.

If, for instance, their Lord had not died, how is it possible that they could have declared that the Jewish priests and people, then and there living, had accused Him; that the governor then in office had tried and condemned Him; that the whole city had, but a short time before, been agitated by these proceedings, and witnessed His public execution; that the governor, satisfied on special inquiry that He was really dead, had ordered His body to be given up to His friends for interment; and that His corpse had been guarded in the tomb by a band of soldiers then and there in service, and specially ordered on this duty? How, we ask, is all this possible? Let us bring the subject home, and ask if it is possible to imagine a similar attempt to deceive this community—to make our civil, military, and ecclesiastical authorities believe, contrary to truth, that they had recently taken part in such transactions; and to make the public at large believe that they had just seen what they never have seen, and just done what they never have done? Impossibility and absurdity are written in broad and unequivocal characters on the very face of such a supposition.

And if the death of Jesus was thus a matter of the most public notoriety, and the guarding of His body was thus an act of authority, expressly to prevent its removal under pretence of a resurrection, the mere assertion that He had risen carries with it great strength of evidence. If that was not the fact, the lifeless body would have been produced to the shame and confusion of the deceivers. For the contemptible story with which the guards would silence suspicion, that while they slept the disciples stole the body, carries with it its own refutation. The obvious inquiry at once suggests itself, How could they be witnesses of what occurred while they were asleep? Besides: to sleep on his post was death to a Roman soldier. Except, then, where impious accomplices were to receive this excuse, and have their ends answered by it, it would not surely have been made. And its utter improbability, the extent of offence and of danger to the offenders, and consequently to the accusers, which it involved, and the great ease with which its falsehood could have been exposed, rendered it impossible for the disciples to have invented the story of this excuse. And equally inconceivable is it, that they would tell the world, in the face of these very guards, that they had shrunk from their post at the appearance of an angel, and the shock of an earthquake, if no such thing had happened.

Thus the narrative of the resurrection of Christ, as presented to us in the Gospel, is conclusive evidence in favor of that fact; for there is proof—let it be repeated—as strong as can establish any past event, from both friends and foes, that this narrative was published in the very place, and at the very time, in which Christ was asserted to have risen, and these several connected circumstances were said to have transpired. However therefore the resurrection of Jesus might be supposed questionable, if it had been assigned to some remote period, it is morally impossible that, if false, it would have been promulged, with all these circumstances, as an event then recent, well known, and subject to the severest scrutiny.

But we perceive further evidence of the resurrection of Christ in the conduct of the witnesses. They shrunk from no sufferings, exposed themselves to every hardship, submitted to the vilest cruelties, and encountered the most lingering and torturing deaths, in support of this truth, which they regarded as the main pillar of their faith and hope.

Let not their conduct be compared with that of wild enthusiasts, who may not unreasonably be supposed so strongly deluded as to think themselves suffering for righteousness' sake, when they are but the victims of a disordered fancy. It was no mere matter of feeling for which the apostles encountered sufferings and death. It was for nothing that can admit the construction of a deluded imagination. It was in testimony of a fact respecting which they could not be deceived. It was for asserting that One whom they well knew had been with them after His death, and that they had conversed with Him, eaten with Him, and had various intercourse with Him, for the space of forty days. Is it possible for twelve men to think all this, if it was not so? And is it possible that they did not think it, and yet unanimously persevered in declaring it, through a course of the most bitter sufferings? The supposition evinces vastly greater credulity than any that can be required by the Christian system.

Safely then may we challenge the citation of any historical event supported by stronger evidence than the resurrection of Christ.

And if Christ is risen, the seal of Heaven is set to the justice of the claims to character which He avowed.

Chief among these is that to the divine nature.

"I and My Father are One." "I am in the Father and the Father in Me." "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." "Before Abraham was, I AM." "I lay down My life, that *I* might *take it again. I have power* to take it again."

These are a few among many expressions of our Lord, in which He evidently claims the divine nature, and speaks of His future resurrection as justifying the claim, and to be effected by His own power. If these were the expressions of a mere creature, what could they be short of blasphemy! And yet the seal of Heaven was set to them; for He was released from the prison of the tomb, and arose from the dead. Surely then He can be none other than what He claimed to be, our Lord and our God. He laid down His life, and in the exercise of His divine power, took it again.

Let then humble penitents, who would find in His sufferings and death atonement for their sins, satisfaction to their offended God, and a way of escape from the terrors of His violated law, look with lively faith to their risen Saviour, and be comforted by this grand completion of the evidence of His possessing that divinity which enables Him to be a sufficient Saviour to a world of sinners. In HIM they have for a Redeemer and an Advocate the eternal and only begotten Son of God. HE entered the conflict with our spiritual foes, and undertook to appease that almighty justice which would otherwise have left us exposed to their dreadful and unending malice. In that mighty conflict He endured the severity of their rage, and stood the shock of their bitterest inflictions. In that wondrous work of love, He bore the heaviest of His Father's wrath, and sank to death under the arm which pressed upon Him as our Representative. He has done the work. He comes off more than conqueror. He proclaims the welcome tidings that His atonement is accepted, and that penitent sinners may be justified freely. This will be the blessed privilege of all who stay on Him with a true and living faith, with genuine repentance, and in the humble, devout, and diligent performance of the conditions on which is suspended the salvation that was so dearly bought.

Christian pilgrims, who feel that they are but strangers and sojourners upon earth, having here no continuing city, but looking for another; Christian sufferers, who are called to walk in their Saviour's thorny path of trial and of sorrow; Christian mourners, who have followed their pious relatives and friends to the house appointed for all living; and Christians on whose hearts the slow but sure progress, or the rapidly approaching issue, of fatal disease, impresses the certainty that eternity draweth nigh; should gladly regard the present beckonings of the Church to look to their risen Saviour, and see in Him their Lord and their God, who, having consecrated the tomb by His blessed presence, comes to proclaim liberty to the captive, and the opening of prison to them that are bound. He comes to announce the victory which, with His own right hand, and with His holy arm, He hath gotten over the king of terrors. He entered his domain, but that He might vanquish him. He has plucked from him his sting. He has burst his bands asunder. He has quenched his fiery darts in His own most precious blood. He returns from the conflict, bearing the trophies of victory. He gives that victory to His faithful people, and bids them follow Him in a joyful resurrection. Overcoming the sharpness of death, He opens the kingdom of heaven to all believers.

Let all the children of Holy Church remember that He whose resurrection from the dead she now calls them to commemorate, as that of the Saviour who would thus confirm their faith in Him, is their God, whom they are bound to obey, their Redeemer, to whom they should cleave, and the only Author of their hope in life, in death, and through eternity, whom they should love. If they withhold allegiance from Him, violate His laws, or neglect His institutions and requirements, awful is the consideration that He is their Lord and their God—almighty—long-suffering indeed—merciful indeed to the faithful and penitent; but who will by no means spare the guilty who obstinately refuse His grace. Towards them He will tremendously display the extent of that almighty power whereby He can repay vengeance, eternal vengeance, to His adversaries.

B. T. O.

For the Churchman.

Episcopal Resignations.

Mr. Editor,—The only canon allowing and providing for Episcopal resignations, is the fourth of the General Convention of 1844. The resignation by that canon, is to be of *Episcopal Jurisdiction.* (Section i. 34.) Is Bishop Onderdonk now possessed of such jurisdiction? If so, is he not competent to invite brother bishops to officiate in and for the diocese? If not, can he act under the canon? Has he a right to tender, can the bishops receive, his resignation of an office, merely titular, and uninvested with that attribute—Jurisdiction—of which only there is canonical provision for resignation?

In short, is not our diocese placed by the higher authorities just in that position in which Christian submission and canonical allegiance require us to sit still, until release comes from the same source, and jurisdiction being restored to the bishop, he is in a condition to act under the canon? QUESTION.

For the Churchman.

Letters of Consecration—Episcopal Registers.

Mr. Editor,—It has been the practice to insert in the Appendix to the Journal of each General Convention, copies of the Letters of Consecration of such as were admitted to the Episcopate at or about the time of any such Convention. Six Bishops were consecrated during and just after the late General Convention; but, on examination of the Journal thus published, I do not find any evidence whatever of their consecration. It is true the consecrations are no part of the acts of the House of Bishops; but, as the printed Journals are sometimes preserved for reference, it is a pity the Appendix does not afford the usual notification of the facts of consecration, especially as very differing statements as to the consecrations have been made by the weekly papers. The circumstance leads me to inquire whether any Episcopal Registers are required by our canons to be kept in the several sees; and especially whether there can be any where an official register of acts like that of consecration, in which the concurrent action of several bishops is made necessary by the canons and by ecclesiastical usage?

The reports of Episcopal acts entered on the Journals of the several Diocesan Conventions annually do not properly constitute Episcopal Registers. The printed copies are in the keeping of no one; and in the lapse of a few months or years may disappear. The Journals, if engrossed and preserved in volumes, (and this ought in all cases to be done,) are in the custody, not of the several bishops or their officials, but in that of the Conventions. B. C.

The Churchman.

New York: Saturday, March 29, 1845.

On our last page will be found the pamphlet to which we referred last week, "What shall the Diocese do?" Since our former notice we have understood that this pamphlet has made a very different impression on the minds of some of our friends from what it left on our own; and indeed we have received a copy of it crowded with marginal notes in pencil, excepting to almost all its positions, and going to sustain the opinion which we have heard expressed that the work is that of an enemy in disguise. Possibly they who think thus, may either know or have some strong opinion, which we have not, as to the source from which it came: of this our readers must judge. For our own part after reading it a second time, and with the advantage of the notes just referred to, we see no reason to abandon our first impression; and if the pamphlet come from an opponent it is, in fact, a gratifying admission on his part, that the good temper and good sense which he wears as a mask, is the natural and familiar face of those whom he essays to deceive.

We expressed our acquiescence in (with one exception) the *general positions* of the pamphlet; and as the correctness of these has been called in question, we shall recapitulate them and explain the grounds of our acquiescence.

1. The first position is that in the case of our Bishop, "we have no judgment to form, no opinion to express." But this position the writer carefully guards by saying *for all purposes of ecclesiastical action*, and by adding that "as individuals, we may read the case and rightfully say, that we would or would not have come to the same conclusion: and afterwards he speaks favorably of bringing the matter before the General Convention. This is precisely our view of the matter. We consider the verdict (from the very face of the presentment, and without looking at the evidence) to be unjust, and the sentence illegal; and we have felt free to say so from the first, while at the same time we have thought, and still think, that it would not be in good faith with other Dioceses for New York to take any definitive stand against the sentence before the General Convention had, in view of it, defined the meaning of the Canon on which it depends for support.

The writer then expostulates with those friends of the Bishop who believing him innocent "*cannot submit* to see him wrongfully sacrificed;" and exhorts them to be patient, and to remember that "their duty to the Church and to the maintenance of her lawful authority, is paramount to the claims" which they are disposed to assert by the independent *ecclesiastical action* (against which, as he before said, he is directing his argument) of the Diocese; the same view which we have taken from the first, and to which we still adhere.

2. The writer next explains what he means by submitting to authority; and that is to carry out the judgment of the Court without regard to technical rules and limitations, with the spirit of Christian obedience, and in its full scope and intent. Now from the first it has appeared to us that there were but two courses to choose; the one of independent diocesan action, the other of submission; and having made choice, without hesitation of the latter, we cannot but concur with the writer in the emphasis which he has placed on it.

The writer thinks that "another thing implied in submission to our Church is that we abstain from all uncharitable judgments and harsh censures of the motives and conduct of those who are set over us as spiritual fathers." To this of course all must agree; though some, by a dulness or obliquity of mind, transfer to the *judgment* the *harshness* and *uncharitableness* which really belong to the persons or acts which the *judgment* respects. There are many passages of ecclesiastical history the actors and acts of which must appear harsh and uncharitable to the judgment; and when the same judgment is dispassionately and deliberately formed respecting the majority of the late Court and its proceedings, it would be futile to impute to the judgment the qualities which it only discovers in the objects judged. We have not suspected the writer of any such weakness; but have understood him to inculcate the duty of cool and Christian judgment, and of guarding ourselves with supreme and most anxious solicitude against withdrawing confidence from men *before* they have lost their integrity. And if we need such lessons of caution (as surely we do) in judging of the dead, how much more in judging of the living, and in matters in which our personal interests and feelings are hugely concerned! Whoever be the writer we thank him for his good and timely advice on this head.

3. The next position of the writer is that the remedy of the existing evils does not rest with us either individually or as a diocese. We are not responsible for their origin, (except so far as our sins have given occasion to them,) we are not responsible for their continuance, we are not responsible for their removal. The immediate responsibility rests with the late Court, the ultimate responsibility with the General Convention. If the General Convention have provided a wholesome Canon, and if the Court have rightly understood and wisely administered it to the good of the Bishop, the diocese and the Church at large, theirs be the praise, theirs the wisdom! If the General Convention have provided a bad Canon, and if the Court have abused the trust reposed in them by a wrong construction and unfaithful administration of the Canon under which they acted, theirs be the blame, theirs the folly and injustice. In either case we have nothing to do but to submit, and quietly to suffer the privations and hardships until those who are responsible for them see fit to remove them. Any other course on our part would lead to the dissolution of the present union of our dioceses; a result which Bishop Onderdonk himself seems to have feared when in his address to the Court he prays "that the sentence which my right reverend brethren are now to pronounce on the most unworthy of their number *may not alienate from our body the confidence of the Church and plunge her into irretrievable distraction*;" and to which Bishop Gadsden more plainly alludes when he says in his Opinion: "No good ["from this prosecution"] will come to our ecclesiastical confederacy. I pray God that much evil may not come to it; that it may not be shaken to its very centre by the proceedings and decision in this prosecution." But a result surely which the sufferings of a Diocese (*salva fide*) for a few years or even an entire generation would not be too much to avert.

5. Concurring most cordially with the writer as respects the limits of our responsibility and the duty of submission and suffering, we now enter with him on the consideration of the modes of relief which have been proposed.

1. *Restoration.* On this point, reserving his *reasons* for separate consideration, we would here express acquiescence in his *conclusion.* In other words, we think with him that there are grave objections to restoration, "*so far* (to use his own words and his own italics) *as it is to be the result of any action for the purpose on the part of this Diocese.*"

The Diocese has no authority to restore the Bishop to the right of exercising his Episcopal and ministerial functions. Strictly speaking, there is no body or tribunal in the Church which has this authority; the most that even the General Convention can do is, we apprehend, either to confirm the Canon in that sense of it on which the late Court has rested its sentence, and thus constructively to ratify the sentence, or to give a different explanation of the Canon, and thus constructively to declare the sentence null and void; in which case it would lose even the semblance of authority. There can be no doubt, we presume, that the revision of the Canon will be part of the business of the next General Convention; and whether it be brought to the notice of that body by a declaration of our next Diocesan Convention, as we suggested that it *might* be, or by a *respectful submission* of the matter to the same body by our Diocesan Convention of 1847 as the writer suggests, or without any Diocesan action, is is a matter of secondary importance.

2. *Resignation.* We are almost ashamed to say that we agree with the writer in opposition to resignation, "*so far as it is to be the result of any action on the part of the Diocese,*" so very monstrous should we account a demand for resignation *on the part of the Convention.* Individuals are more free to form and express their opinions; but that the Convention of the Diocese should demand the suspended Bishop to resign would be (as it seems to us) an act of rebellion not only against the Bishop, but against the Church which by her highest judicial authority has suspended, and by her highest legislative authority must be presumed (until she declare or have opportunity to declare the contrary) to sanction his suspension, not only as a Bishop, but as the Bishop of the Diocese of New York.

But while the writer very properly contends that there should be no action on the part of the Convention to bring about a resignation, he expresses the opinion that a *voluntary resignation* on the part of the Bishop is highly desirable. This is the point in the pamphlet with which we are dissatisfied. The penalty of the Court, as we understand it, is *suspension* and not *resignation*; and we cannot approve of any act or even *wish* on the part of any Churchman in the Diocese to avoid the penalty. The very desire of the writer for resignation, the very confession that such an event is desirable seems to us not to comport with the excellent lessons which he has given us on Christian submission. Undoubtedly *resignation* (or the vacation of Diocesan jurisdiction, which would be of equivalent force) would have been a much more agreeable sentence than that which has been imposed. But we are not choosers in the matter; we are not the authors of the sentence; we have nothing to do but to suffer it and to help each other in suffering it; to "bear one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of CHRIST" and his Church. Whether the Bishop (who, by the deprivation of his salary is reduced to beggary) will have strength to suffer the sentence; whether the Diocese will have grace to suffer and help him suffer it; are points on which we have no opinion to express; but for our own part our mind is made up, God being our helper, to suffer and to help suffer the sentence as long as it lasts, without even a wish to escape from it except in an orderly and canonical way.

Sympathizing, therefore, in the temper and approving the positions of "A Layman," we would deprecate all such diocesan action as would be adverse to peace and refer the whole matter to the next General Convention. If that body constructively confirm the sentence we must look to God for relief and prepare for graver duties than we have ever yet had to discharge. If that body give such a construction to the Canon as shows the present sentence to be incompatible with its intention; or if the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies alone do this, so that both Houses, after the matter being brought before them, refuse by a concurrent action, to sustain that construction of the Canon on which the sentence depends for its validity, the sentence is dead and the Bishop and the Diocese are relieved. Then the question of the Bishop's resignation or resumption of official duties will be *entertainable*; now it is not; and then the arguments of "A Layman" against a *restoration*, or as we should say against a resumption of duties, will deserve a respectful consideration. Meantime we have only to practise his excellent lessons of patience and submission.

We give below an extract of a letter to Floyd Smith, Esq., of this city, from Dr. Upfold, intended as a defence of the Committee on Canons (of which Dr. Upfold was Chairman) in the last General Convention from some blame which has been understood to be cast on it. We regret that Dr. Upfold should think that blame has been imputed to the Committee, though we are happy to have, in whatever way, his important corroboration of the view of the Canon taken by our correspondent "Neo-Cesarea." Well might our correspondent say that the Convention is not responsible for a trial which has been held in contravention of its clearly manifested design (as far as the House of Deputies is concerned) as well as the first principles of law and morality.

And now let me say a few words on another subject, in which I have some personal interest. I have understood that the Canon of 1844 on the Trial of a Bishop, is much faulted in your city, (in one letter which I have received it is emphatically called "the Black Canon,") and what I regard as both ungenerous and unjust, blame is imputed to the Committee on Canons of the House of Deputies, with whom the Canon originated. Now I wish to disabuse your mind of such impressions if they exist, and therefore offer a few remarks in explanation and defence, which you may, if you please, and in any way you may deem proper, communicate to such as are disposed to fault the Canon and censure the Committee. The Canon, I admit, is imperfect, and in some of its provisions, liable to perversion and abuse, though not necessarily so, only by a violation of its spirit and intention, in the conduct of proceedings under it. These imperfections, I was aware of at the time of its passage, but believed were not of sufficient importance to arrest the action of the House, by the proposal of amendments, which would have prolonged discussion, so as probably to have defeated its passage, and consequently defeated the principal object which I had in view, viz: its provision for a case in which my own diocese was especially interested, in its 9th Section. And, as in common I believed with most, if not all my colleagues in the Committee, I regarded the Canon as having necessarily, from its absolute repeal of the former Canon, an exclusive prospective application and operation; and knowing, besides, that with all the other Canons it would be subjected to the strongest revision of the Committee appointed ad interim to revise and codify the Canons, I was desirous that its passage should be embarrassed as little as possible by amendments, and so expressed myself to gentlemen who were prepared to propose amendments. A protracted debate in other matters had greatly delayed the action of the House, and as the details of the Canon had been carefully arranged in Committee and the solitary section alluded to was the only part of it that I thought would in any reasonable probability be acted on within the ensuing three years, I earnestly pressed its passage without any farther delay. The design of this Canon and of that on Episcopal resignation, it need not be concealed, was chiefly to meet an existing emergency, which the former Canons on the same points, did not meet effectually. And before I reported either of them to the House, one of my clerical colleagues of the Pennsylvania delegation and myself, were assured by one of the Bishops that he had in his possession two documents in relation to the emergency alluded to, which as soon as the Canons passed and became the law of the Church, he was prepared to and would present, and which would constitute action de novo under each. The impression, which I think was generally shared by the Committee, certainly by myself, as to the prospective application of both these Canons, was shared also by several legal gentlemen in the House, who suggested to me, that the passage of the Canon on resignation, which was particularly spoken of, would overthrow all we had done in our special Diocesan Convention. I replied I was fully aware of, and prepared for such an effect, but I did not feel at liberty to say how and in what way. And when that Canon was under discussion in the House, a reverend delegate from Ohio, put the question openly and directly to me as the Chairman of the Committee—"What would be the effect of this Canon if passed, and when passed upon the proceedings of the special Convention of Pennsylvania?" To which I answered, as you will probably recollect—*It will nullify them.* In this opinion he appeared to acquiesce, for he did not deny its correctness, nor did any other person express a contrary opinion, or intimate a doubt that such would be the effect. As to any ex post facto application of the Canon, that I regarded as impossible, or rather that the Church never had and never would recognize such an application and operation. And so in respect of the Canon on the Trial of a Bishop; the only action which could take place under it, was in my judgment, entirely prospective, and in relation to offences committed after its passage. And with all respectful deference to those concerned, I cannot but think the proceedings of the late Court in New York, were in violation of what I have always understood to be a settled principle of justice and of the civil law, and therefore of ecclesiastical law which certainly ought to be at least equally just with the former, in giving to that Canon an ex post facto application. Instead then of faulting the Canon and censuring the Committee who reported it, the fault and blame, if any, belongs to its administration; which administration, I cannot divest myself of the impression, though probably standing alone in such judgment, being ex post facto, is in its results, as I am told by legal gentlemen would be its effect in the secular courts, null and void.

Let me say, further, in reference to an objection which has been much insisted on, as I have understood, and as I think justly, though in the present instance its injurious operation is owing to a perversion of the spirit and intention of the canon, viz. the provision for presentment by three bishops; that that provision was introduced in order to accommodate this Canon to that on Episcopal resignation, which declared that a bishop who had resigned, was still amenable to trial, for offences subsequently committed, to the House of Bishops, and who, having no diocese, could not be presented otherwise than by three bishops. It will be seen by the stringent enactments in relation to presentment by a Convention, that the Committee could not have contemplated, as was certainly my impression, the presentment of a bishop having jurisdiction, otherwise than by his own diocesan Convention. True, the presentment by three bishops was a provision of the former canon, which this absolutely repealed, but it was incorporated in this, for the purpose before mentioned, to meet the case of a bishop who had resigned. We never contemplated, certainly I did not, the presentment of any Diocesan Bishop except by his own Convention, or by three bishops, at the instance and request of his Convention, surely in no case by three bishops independently, and without any complaint on the part of his own diocese by its Convention.

This explanation, I trust, will be regarded as exculpating both the Committee and the Canon. The Canon was drafted by a clerical member, eminently skilled in Canon law, as is evinced by his valuable "Comments on the Constitution and Canons of the Church," and carefully considered by the Committee, who bestowed on it much and anxious thought, and made several important amendments, as appears from the original draft in my possession. Their error, if error be imputed to them, as I understand it is, was in judgment, not in intention. They certainly did not mean to originate a law which might be perverted to purposes of injustice in regard to a bishop and his diocese, and to an invasion of the independence and the disturbance of the peace, and the perplexing of the action of the latter. For, finally, they never contemplated an indefinite suspension of a bishop, but suspension strictly, limited either by conditions, or by the mention of definite time."

The subjoined article from the Churchman's Newspaper, a strongly "Anti-Tractarian" paper published in the diocese of London, reflects so severely on some whose character we hold in high respect, that gratified as we were with its views respecting our late diocesan troubles, we had made up our mind not to insert it in our columns. From those of our friends, however, who have seen it, we have received so many and earnest requests to insert it this week, that we have given it to the printer at a late hour on the day that our paper goes to press. This must account to correspondents and others for the exclusion of much else that is expected to appear.

Those who are offended with its plainness and freedom must make allowance for the different style of thinking and writing which prevails in a country where men are not in the habit of feeling the pulse of their readers before they give utterance to their thoughts.

Disturbed and lamentable as is the state of the Church amongst us, the condition of our sister Church in America appears to be still more unhappy. The same controversy which has been producing so much mischief amongst us has travelled across the Atlantic, and caused great disturbance and injury to the Church of Christ in the United States. Nearly all the Romanizing publications which have been published in England have been republished in that country, and have called forth much the same opposition, and produced the same sort of strife and division which they have excited here. Books and pamphlets have been written by American Bishops and other clergymen on both sides, and the minds of people considerably agitated, and, we think, in every respect, most unnecessarily so.

But nothing seems to have afforded the latitudinarian, or low party, an opportunity for the display of their notions and feelings, and of those tactics to which they too frequently resort when they have an object to gain, and feelings to gratify, until the ordination of Mr. Arthur Carey, by the Bishop of New York. This young man had read some of the publications of the small school of Romanizers in the English Church, and seems to have imbibed some of their notions, and to have said and done some things which rather proved his honesty to his own belief, than the soundness of that belief or his own judgment and discretion. The Right Reverend Dr. Onderdonk, Bishop of New York, admitted Mr. Carey, who appears to have been a clever and amiable young man, to the Holy Order of Deacons. This gave occasion to the Recordite party in the Church of Christ in America to raise the cry of popery, not only against Mr. Carey, but against the Bishop of New York, and the college in which Mr. Carey had been educated. The college was instantly overhauled; but it stood the attack very well, neither popish Jesuits, nor popish relics, nor popish garments, nor even a mass book, a crucifix, a miraculous medal, a scapular, or an odd string of beads, being discovered therein.

The college thus luckily escaped the vengeance of the puritanical party more easily than their suspicions; but this only resulted in the concentration of all their factious animosity upon the heads of the Bishop of New York and Mr. Carey. The latter seem, to have been much harrassed by the conduct manifested towards him, became ill, was ordered to a more southern climate across the water, for his health; but while on the ocean, far away from his country and friends, his soul took its flight to God, and his body went to the bottom of the sea, there to await the glorious resurrection.

Here one would have thought the matter would have been allowed to rest; but no, Bishop Onderdonk was still alive, and the same abominable conduct as has been pursued towards the Bishop of Exeter was pursued towards him. In the Convention of his own Diocese steps were pertinaciously, and we had almost said audaciously, taken to procure his condemnation for ordaining Mr. Carey. His enemies were foiled, but only for a time; for the matter was brought before the General Convention of the whole Church, then about to assemble; but here again they met with no better success. Untiring, however, in their scheming and movements, they gathered up some loose rumors that had for several years been afloat, derogatory to the modesty and purity of the Bishop, and three of the Bishops were unfortunately induced to present him to the Convention, which appointed a Commission of Bishops to try him. The Commissioners met, heard evidence, and, contrary to all expectation, condemned him to suspension from his office as a Bishop in the Church of God, and from all the functions of the sacred Ministry.

These charges against the Bishop were of the most paltry character, and run back from two-and-a-half to some eight years ago. They were three in number, and amount to this: that in his warm-hearted and affectionate manner in conversation, he had thoughtlessly placed his hand upon a lady's shoulder, and this, it seems, in the presence of her husband and other parties. But this was quite enough to be exaggerated very soon into his putting his hand into her bosom, which was the utmost alleged against him in this and two other similar cases. And the evidence in each case, be it remembered, rested upon the testimony of only one person; whereas the Scriptural command, and the law of England are, "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before *two* or *three* witnesses." In America, however, it seems that the accusation of *one* witness is quite sufficient to condemn even a Bishop.

We, who live in a land where we happily enjoy, in all its glorious reality, that freedom of which in America they seem to have only the pretence, are astonished that the Bishop should have been condemned on such testimony, and for acts, not one of which was a crime cognizable in human courts: all were, even according to the worst construction that could be put upon them, but such offences against the decencies and manners of life, as society is sufficiently shielded against by private expressions of displeasure and the established rules of social intercourse. This is not our opinion merely, but, as far as we can learn from our American papers and private correspondence, the judgment of all persons not interested in putting down the Bishop.

The person most active in the business appears to have been one Paul Trapier, a clergyman, who if one may judge from the canting and self-contradictory "narrative" which he has published, and from his name, seems as likely to be a popish Jesuit priest, in disguise, as anything else. And if he be, it is not the first time that a popish Jesuit has taken a similar course to inflict injury upon a Church which every papist is taught to hate and to do his best to destroy. No papist, unless within the Church, could have done her so much injury, as this unrighteous condemnation of the Catholic Bishop of New York. If, indeed, the condemnation be just, the parties who have brought it about have most effectually ruined their own characters by their proceedings; for the deeds for which the Bishop has been condemned were committed from two and a half to eight years ago, and they have, therefore, on their own showing, suffered a high and prominent criminal to go unpunished for so long a period. This is something like being accessories after the fact, and sufficient, in some cases, at least, according to the law of England, to subject such parties to rather severe punishment. At all events nobody will believe that they had that great regard for the Church, religion, and morality to which they pretended, or they would have proceeded against the Bishop years before this last General Convention. Why, moreover, were not the charges laid before the Convention of the Diocese of New York, held some little time before the General Convention? Certainly not from a wish to show the Bishop any indulgence, as the conduct of some of his enemies clearly demonstrated during the session of that Assembly. According to the Church Discipline Act, passed a few years ago here in England, and now in operation, no clergyman can be proceeded against at all, unless the deeds for which it is sought to punish him were committed within the two years last past, before the initiatory proceedings be taken.

But there are abundant circumstances connected with this most lamentable case which obviate all necessity for any facts or reasoning in this direction, and which relieve it of its more painful aspect—circumstances which, by their bearing in another direction, suggest only very mournful reflections. The Bishop of New York has been tried on one ground—he is firmly believed to have been condemned on another. He has been tried on a question of morals; he is believed to have been condemned on a question of orthodoxy, or what the latitudinarian party consider orthodoxy. His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin has inquired whether the Church in America has by any formal act, condemned the ordination of the Rev. Mr. Carey. Will the decision in the present case satisfy his Grace?

What the end of this most grievous business will be it is almost impossible to foresee. It appears that every day is bringing to light new facts to show that this trial was the result of a conspiracy. Men hostile to the Bishop, on account of his theological views have left no stone unturned in their endeavors to blacken his character. Their iniquitous tales have been repeated till some have begun to fear them true, and at length ended in believing them so. Is it strange if some, unaccustomed to the position of judges, and anxious for the spread of what they considered truth, should have rendered a verdict influenced by opinions formed from without? Besides, at least six of his judges should not, from what we understand, have sat upon that bench to condemn their brother. Three of them, if they had followed the usage of civil or military courts, would have declined to sit; and all were fit subjects for challenge, if challenge had been allowed. Those three stood before the Church as his accusers on another matter, each also having his private griefs to sway him. Of the other three, one was absent while nearly all of the testimony for the defence was submitted: one is the assistant and expected successor of the Bishop who headed the prosecution; and one could enter upon the records of the court an argument for a lighter punishment, and vote twice for the highest.

The Canon under which the trial was conducted, was passed at the recent General Convention, some say, under the expectation of using it for the Bishop's downfall. It is very defective; it does not recognize the principle of Scripture and all previous Canon law, that two or more witnesses are necessary to establish a crime in an Ecclesiastical Court. It provides for no limitation of time, so that, under it, some of the Bishops may be tried for offences alleged to have been committed five and twenty years ago. It does not secure the right of challenge. It provides for no appeal. Such being its character, now that it has done its work, we venture to predict that it will never be acted upon again. The Bishop has published a statement of the facts and circumstances connected with the trial. Its truthful story, and the unanswerable arguments of the six Bishops who adjudged him not guilty, have so impressed the public mind of the Church in America, that he is held to be an innocent and persecuted man by all who before the trial did not believe him guilty and wished him to be so adjudged.

The position of the Diocese of New York is rendered peculiarly unfortunate by the judgment of the Court. The Canons of the American Church make no provision for the case of a Diocese with a Bishop suspended. There is no Canonical way of administering such a Diocese. It is brought to a dead stand; and must so remain, unless the law of necessity shall prevail, as long as the suspension exists. The suspension itself is, most extraordinarily, without conditions or limitations, and on this account cannot be otherwise than utterly illegal; and it would seem, from the Canon itself, to be improper, if not void; for, as no time is specified during which the suspension is to last, and the Court which awarded it is dissolved, and no Court or means in existence which can now fix a period for its termination, it amounts to *deposition*, and should not have been called *suspension*; for if the Bishop be suspended for life, and, as we have already said, the American Church has yet provided no means for removing the suspension, in what does it differ from deposition? The Canon under which the judicial Bishops acted prescribes three distinct grades of punishment, namely "admonition," "suspension," and "deposition." These penalties were evidently designed to be, and are, different in kind and degree. Suspension is a higher degree of punishment than admonition, and deposition than suspension. We contend, therefore, that the Court had no right to inflict the penalty of suspension in such a way as to make it equal in effect with deposition—in fact, the very same thing.

"Now, if," as a writer in one of the American papers very justly argues, "the Court designed to render Bishop Onderdonk *defunctus officio* for life, there was but one sentence that, in the evident meaning of the Canon, could effect that object, viz. the sentence of deposition. The sentence of suspension cannot have that effect, without destroying the legitimate meaning and operation of the Canon, as we have shown, by confounding the second with the third grade of penalty.

"Again: the illegality of the sentence will appear from the necessary effect which it has upon the Diocese. There is no special provision, either in the constitution or Canons, made for a Diocese whose Bishop is suspended. It is not a *vacant* Diocese, for the simple reason that no new Bishop or Assistant Bishop can be elected to its episcopate. The episcopate is filled, though the sentence of the Court suspends its operation. What, then, is the result? Why, the Bishop cannot act, nor can the Standing Committee act, as they would be empowered to do by the Canons, if the Diocese were vacant. Other Bishops are expressly prohibited, by the fourth Article of the Constitution, from performing any episcopal act in a Diocese which is not vacant."

Thus the Church of the Diocese of New York is, as it respects its episcopal privileges, suspended—is dead, and would seem to be reduced almost to a Prebyterian community, or to a number of distinct and independent Congregational or Brownist communities. In fact, these haters of Popery have virtually laid the Church of New York under a sort of interdict, only of a more tyrannical and destructive nature than any Popish interdict, inasmuch as there is no power in existence able to remove it. It could never be the object of the General Convention, in framing and passing this Canon, to place, by suspension, the Diocese under the ban of proscription. The sentence is illegal, and necessarily void; for the Diocese cannot possibly abide by it. It is a question of life and death to the Church of New York. It is not improbable that his enemies hope that, by placing the Bishop and his Diocese in such a predicament, they will drive him to resign; but this we hope he will never think of doing, for he would thereby concur in a sentence which, up to the present time, himself and six of his colleagues—Bishops Ives, Doane, Kemper, De Lancey, Gadsden, and Whittingham—have resisted as unrighteous.

The Church in America seems to pass its Canons with far too little deliberation and foresight: and if the members of her General Convention be not more considerate and cautious in future, they will, as in this unfortunate case of the Bishop of New York, involve themselves and their Church in almost inextricable difficulties—difficulties which the Papists and her other dissenting enemies will cause to tell very powerfully against her.

* * *

The Bishop of New York we consider a most iniquitously persecuted man, and calmly declare our conviction, that he is *entirely innocent.* We trust, however, that the whole of these most unhappy proceedings will be overruled for the good of the American Church. The meek and truly Christian bearing of the suspended Bishop, is, we are rejoiced to hear, beyond all praise.

We cannot conclude without again expressing our deep regret at the mischief which Messrs. Newman, Ward, Oakeley, and other almost-Papists within the Catholic Church of England, have done to the Church in America, as well as at home. The mind of Mr. Carey, an ardent young man, unable to distinguish between truth and error, cleverly blended, was poisoned by the writings of Mr. Newman, and led to say and do things which were laid hold of, and made the foundation of all this sorrowful trouble to the American Church. Well would it have been for these Romanizers, and for those branches of Christ's Holy Catholic Church existing, by God's mercy, in this country, and in America, if they had never written a line. It behoves them to set earnestly about undoing the mischief they have done, with tenfold more energy, zeal, and perseverance than they did it. This is the only way in which they can show that they do really possess that filial and reverential love for their Mother Church, of which they sometimes so largely talk.

We mentioned last week, in a summary way, the result of the Oxford Convocation, as that has been an event of really great importance, apart from any personal interest attached to it.

Mr. Ward was heard in his defence before the first measure was put to vote, and spent an hour and a half in repelling the charge of bad faith in subscription. Before the second question was put, he observed merely, that a greater punishment was to be inflicted on him, attached as he was to the Church of England, and ready to serve her, than had been even proposed towards those who had actually left her for Rome. The next day he addressed a letter to the Vice Chancellor, firmly asserting the futility of the decision, and considering his position not at all morally affected by it. He was to apply to the Court of Queen's Bench for a *mandamus* to the University, to restore him to his degrees as soon as the Easter term began. As to the probability of success it is but fair to say, that although the two advocates mentioned in our last summary decided the (then) proposed degradation to be illegal, others to whom the same case has been submitted are of another and opposite opinion. The popularity of the measure at Oxford may, perhaps, be inferred from the cheers with which the undergraduates received Mr. Ward on leaving Convocation, and the hisses showered on the Vice Chancellor. Among the Non Placets are the names of Dr. Hook, Mr. Gresley, Mr. Churton, Mr. Irons, Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce, Mr. Gladstone and other leading men of the same school.

Mr. Oakeley, who has been supposed to stand on the same theological footing with Mr. Ward, avowed it openly, partly from his friendship for the latter gentleman, partly from an aversion to being at all misunderstood, and partly with a desire to have the powers of Convocation in his own case well understood. Accordingly he made his avowal to the Vice Chancellor immediately after the decision in Mr. Ward's case, but that functionary decided that the powers of Convocation did not extend to non-residents, and he was left to the Bishop of London his diocesan. Whereupon his Lordship suspended him, but at the earnest remonstrance of many persons of influence, including Mr. Gladstone, was induced to remove it. It is now supposed that the case will be tried in an Ecclesiastical Court.

The proposition to condemn No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times had its origin in a too hasty disclosure of intended operations against the Catholic movement. These operations being, as it begins to appear, a systematized effort to enlist High Churchmen on the Evangelical side by first claiming their co-operation against a few of extreme opinions from whom they honestly dissent, then by selecting an object of attack somewhat less offensive to carry them against it by means of the *impetus* acquired in the former movement, and so by degrees carrying them on till no ground is left for themselves to stand upon. To effect this the obnoxious positions must be well chosen and the movements must not be hurried; but in the Oxford tactics too great eagerness has, we think, ruined a game which is certainly playing more successfully among us. To explain, the second enemy marked out for overthrow was one occupying a post so far behind Mr. Ward that the alarm was at once taken. Both Mr. Ward and Mr. Oakeley place a broad and essential distinction between No. 90 and their own ground, not at all allowing the latter to be a development of the former, but rested on an independent principle. And as this was pretty well understood, none but the enemies of both confounding the two views, and as the measure was made to follow the other so closely, the alarm (seems to be well spread, and High Churchmen grown wiser from experience of the disastrous effects of previous disunion will offer an unbroken resistance to the meditated attack on Mr. Newman. We suppose that it will be brought forward again; the veto of the Proctors being employed on the ground that not sufficient time (only a week) had elapsed since it was proposed. A protest against it, published by Mr. Churton, presents such evident reasons for its rejection that we give it entire:—

PROTEST AGAINST THE PROCEEDINGS CONCERNING TRACT 90.—In declaring my intention to vote against the decree which the Heads of Houses have proposed concerning No. 90 of the *Tracts for the Times*, and generally against the measures standing for the 13th of February, I have determined to couple it with this my public protest, as against a course of proceeding of the greatest injustice, impolicy, and public danger.

1. Because the Tract No. 90, whether it be as an argument right or wrong, (and I think it refuted equally by history and principles of sound criticism,) is yet an argument on the interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles, not an attack on their authority. A lawyer may propose a sense of a Law or Statute, which no Judge on the Bench will admit; yet such lawyer is not thereby held to be an assailant of the authority of the law, or an instigator of public sedition.

2. Because the author of Tract No. 90, on its having been notified to him by the Bishop of his Diocese, that his Lordship considered it advisable for the series entitled *Tracts for the Times* to cease, immediately with the other writers of those Tracts, brought the series to a close, and has since withdrawn from all public agitation of the questions therein involved. And it is plainly contrary to justice, that he should now be prosecuted or punished for a publication, which was thus, four years ago, virtually withdrawn, and which he was ready, at the command or express wish of his Diocesan, to have entirely suppressed.

3. Because the author of Tract No. 90 is nothing more than a private clergyman, without preferment, without any public office of teaching in the Church or University. And it is most impolitic, and of the most dangerous precedent, that the University should take upon itself the office of passing judgments and penal decrees on its own members, persons in private stations, for matters of opinion, on which the Church has determined nothing, and on which no decree of the University can pronounce an authoritative judgment.

4. Because the author of Tract No. 90 is a man of the most unblemished private character, of high and well-merited esteem with a large circle of friends, an excellently learned student of Sacred Theology, and a preacher, whose sermons, notwithstanding some doubtful opinions therein contained, have won him the praise and admiration of a large class of the most learned, pious, and well-judging members of the Church of England. And it is most unequal dealing, that while teachers of heresy, and corrupt novelties to the depravation of morals as well as faith, have been passed over without censure, he alone should have been singled out as requiring a sentence, which scarcely anything short of proved depravity could justify.

5. Because the error of Tract No. 90, such as it is, had its rise in a devout wish for the re-union of Christian Churches. And this wish and desire is necessarily so strong in the breast of every Christian, who remembers his Saviour's solemn prayer for his disciples, (John xvii.) that a charitable spirit will be ready to forgive much to one whose zeal misdeems of difficulties in the way of its accomplishment.

6. Because the sentence of a majority in the Oxford House of Convocation cannot prevent the opinions, which it aims to censure, from being entertained by any member of the Church of England, to whom those opinions may commend themselves; and it is the natural effect of persecution to increase the number and stimulate the zeal of adherents to those opinions, which are not allowed a fair field and no favor. It is the natural conclusion of indifferent and impartial men, that opinions are only put down by force and array of numbers, when argument cannot effect a conviction of their unsoundness; and it is the wise sentence of one who saw enough of the futility of these attempts to force conscience, that "the longest sword, the strongest lungs, and *the most voices* are false measures of truth."

7. Lastly, because, as a non-resident member of Convocation, residing at a great distance, and having many public and private calls on my time and such means as a good Providence has placed within my reach, I feel it as a most unfair demand upon both my time and means, that I should be dragged at a great expense from my post of duty, to vote upon a question, which I deny the competence of an Oxford Convocation to decide, but which a regard to the public safety of the Church forbids me to neglect. I protest against these wanton and ineffectual agitations, as occasions on which no fair standard of opinions can be ascertained, at which it is impossible for the poorer members of Convocation to be drawn together, and at which those clerical members who are laboring most diligently at the Church's altars are precluded by their own course of duties from offering their votes. EDWARD CHURTON.

An occurrence which has given rise to much discussion abroad, and which we cannot but regret is the recommendation to the Cambridge Camden Society by its committee that the Society be dissolved. The immediate occasion was a declaration of the Bishop of Exeter, (which by the way several of our papers attribute to Dr. Hook,) in relation, specifically to a seal adopted by the Society, and generally to its (alleged) Romanizing tendency. After such a denunciation, accompanied by the withdrawal of the Bishops of Exeter and Lincoln, and the Chancellor of the University, the committee felt unable to recommend any thing but a total dissolution. The Society however was increasing in prosperity; it numbers nearly 900 members, including nearly all the prominent architects in England, and the extent of its influence is shown by the fact that churches are now building under its directions in New Zealand and China as well as home. The spirit which can contemplate the cessation of such an active agent in the cause of Art and Religion, we must be allowed to think not remotely allied to the Vandalism which overran Rome, and the worse than Vandalism which led Puritan zeal to wanton destruction and sacrilege. In this connection we may state that Sir H. Jenner Fust in the Court of Arches has decided against the legality of stone altars, and that an appeal has been taken from his decision.

Mr. Gladstone's resignation was, it seems, connected with proposed alterations in the education system for Ireland. The grant to Maynooth will be increased to £28,000, and Mr. Gladstone would be at liberty to consider it impartially.

Considerable interest seems to be taken abroad in our affairs. The Churchman's Newspaper takes sides with those here who think the late suspension to have resulted from party prejudice, and to be by no means warranted from the testimony adduced. Mr. Henry McVickar's letter to the Faculty of the General Seminary is reprinted.

A summary of members of the Universities for the present year gives, Members on the Books, Oxford, 5,774; Cambridge, 1926. Members of Convocation, Oxford, 2,998.

In theological literature we observe the publication of Avrillon's Year of Affections, in Dr. Pusey's Devotional Series. Mr. Williams has in press a Harmony of the Resurrection. Mr. Oakeley's letter to the Bishop of London is exceedingly able and temperate; and it is but acting on the principles of common justice to suggest a perusal of it to all who intend making up their minds for or against him. Its operation abroad may be seen in the interference of such men as Mr. Gladstone against his suspension.

Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church,

Residing in the Cities of New York and Brooklyn, with their respective residences.

Onderdonk, D.D., Rt. Rev. Benjamin T., 106 Franklin.
Abercrombie, Rev. R. M., 359 Fourth st., and 3, 129 st.
Akerly, Rev. Benjamin, 76 St. Mark's Place.
Anthon, D.D., Rev. Henry, 2d Avenue, cor. of 10th st.
Balch, Rev. Lewis P. W., 4 Great Jones.
Bedell, Rev. G. T., corner Tenth st. and Fifth avenue.
Berrian, D.D., Rev. William, 50 Varick.
Bradin, Rev. James W., 292 Henry street.
Carder, Rev. J. D., Fort Hamilton, New York Harbor.
Cruse, D.D., Rev. Christian F., 21 First avenue.
Dowdney, Rev. John, 20 John street.
Evans, Rev. Benjamin, 23 Hamilton street.
Everett, Rev. William, 96 Hudson street.
Forbes, Rev. John M., 477 Hudson.
Frazer, Rev. Alexander, 168 Grand street.
Hackley, D.D., Rev. Charles W., 3 College Green.
Haight, Rev. Benjamin I., 3 Rutger's Place.
Harris, Rev. Nathaniel S., 281 Broadway.
Higbee, D.D., Rev. Edward Y., 159 Chambers.
Hoyt, Rev. R., 230 Broome street.
Huddart, Rev. R. Townsend, 422 Houston.
Irving, Rev. Pierre P. 281 Broadway.
Jackson, Rev. C. D., 20 John st., and Rossville, S. I.
Jones, Rev. Lot, 192 Allen street.
Leavenworth, Rev. T. M., 20 Oliver street.
Lyell, D.D., Rev. Thomas, 77 Anthony.
McVickar, D.D., Rev. John, 8 College Green.
Mead, Rev. Edward N., 103 Amity street.
Millett, Rev. James, 31 Irving Place.
Milnor, D.D., Rev. James, 82 Beekman.
Morris, Rev. William, 76 Varick.
Nichols, Rev. Edwin A., 528 Hudson st.
Ogilby, D. D., Rev. John D., Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, Twentieth street.
Pardee, Rev. Isaac, 103 St. Mark's Place, Eighth st.
Parker, Rev. Benjamin C. C., 296 East Broadway.
Peck, Rev. Isaac, 23 Wooster street.
Pound, Rev. Jesse, 50 Fourth street.
Price, Rev. Joseph Henry, 62 Second avenue.
Richmond, Rev. William, Bloomingdale.
Seabury, D.D., Rev. Samuel, 471 Hudson.
Shimeall, Rev. Richard C., 185 Fourth street.
Smith, D.D., Rev. Hugh, 206 Twentieth, next to St. Peter's Church.
Spencer, Rev. Jesse A., 255 Greene street.
Southard, Rev. Samuel L., 26th near 4th avenue.
Taylor, Rev. Fitch W., U. S. N., 697 Broadway.
Taylor, D.D., Rev. Thomas H., 1 Rector st.
Tucker, Rev. John Ireland, 225 Ninth street.
Turner, D.D., Rev. Samuel H., Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, Twentieth.
Verren, Rev. Antoine, 99 Franklin st.
Wainwright, D.D., Rev. Jonathan M., 10 Hubert.
Walton, Rev. W., 2 Abingdon square.
Whitehouse, D. D., Rev. H. J., 120 Eleventh street.
Williamson, Rev. C. H., 72 Murray street.
Wilson, D.D. Rev. Bird, Theological Seminary, Chelsea square, Twentieth.

Brooklyn.

Bancroft, Rev. Charles, 1 Sand street.
Blake, D.D., Rev. John L., 3 Cornell Place, Clinton st.
Carter, Rev. Lawson, Smith st., corner of Livingston.
Cutler, D.D., Benjamin C., 1 Sands street.
Diller, Rev. J. W., Washington avenue, opposite the Collegiate Institute.
Henry, D.D., Rev. Caleb S., 55 Johnson street.
Hunter, Rev. Joseph, Classon avenue.
Johnson, Rev. Evan M., corner of Pearl and Johnson.
Lewis, Rev. William H., Pierrepont, near Fulton.
Messenger, Rev. John F., Pacific st., near Clinton st.
Stone, D.D., Rev. John S., next door to Christ Church.
Vinton, Rev. Francis, Court st., between Schermerhorn and Washington.

Williamsburgh.

Clapp, Rev. Caleb, 3 South Third street.
Haskins, Rev. Samuel M., 1 St. Mark's Place.

Jersey City, N. J.

Barry, D.D., Rev. Edmund D., Essex street.
Patterson, Rev. A. C., Grand street.

Died.

At Lee Town, Va., the residence of his father-in-law, on Sunday morning, the 23d instant, the Rev. FREEMAN CLARKSON, in the 38th year of his age.

His remains have been brought on for interment in the family vault in this city.

At Hudson, on the 13th inst., Mr. CYRUS CURTIS, aged 44 years.

At White Plains, N. Y., on Tuesday, the 18th inst., JOHN, infant son of Rev. Robert W. and Frances Harris.

Also, on Easter Eve, 22d inst., FRANCES, wife of Rev. Robert W. Harris, Rector of Grace Church, White Plains, in the 33d year of her age.

Calendar.

March.

30. First Sunday after Easter.

April.

6. Second Sunday after Easter.
13. Third Sunday after Easter.
20. Fourth Sunday after Easter.
25. St. Mark the Evangelist.
27. Fifth Sunday after Easter, or Rogation Sunday.

28.
29. } Rogation Days.
30.

Notices.

☞ The regular Quarterly Sermon will be preached in St. Matthew's Church, Christopher street, to-morrow evening, March 30th, by the Rev. JOHN S. STONE, D.D. Service to commence at 7½ o'clock. Episcopalians generally, are respectfully invited to attend. March 29.

SEAMEN'S CHURCH.—Divine Service, according to the rites of the Protestant Episcopal Church, will be held every Sunday morning and afternoon, in the Floating Church of our Saviour, at Pike slip, corner of Pike and South streets, where the Bethel Flag is displayed.

The Seamen of the Port of New York are invited to attend. Morning service, 10½ A. M. Afternoon service, 3 P. M.

B. C. C. PARKER,
Feb. 1845. 296 East Broadway.

ST. SIMON'S CHURCH, *Houston street, between Pitt and Ridge streets.*—The services are regularly held every Sunday at half past 10 o'clock in the morning, and at 7 o'clock in the evening. Sunday School at 9, A. M. and at 2, P. M.

C. F. CRUSE,
Feb. 1845. 21 First Avenue.

Acknowledgments.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.—Since his acknowledgment of the 19th of March, the Treasurer has received the following contributions:

A wedding fee, from a clergyman of S C, $5; a gold chain from the Rev Mr Potter of S C, sold for $5; offerings of Trinity ch, Columbia, S C, per Rev P J Shand, $50; Trinity ch, St Augustine, Fa, per Rev F H Rutledge, $20; St Michael's ch, Manchester, N H, per Rev W H Moore, $31 31; Domestic Missions, from Ladies' Sewing Circle of St John's ch, Bangor, Me, $18 22; Zion ch, Pontiac, Mich, $3; collection in Christ ch, Mobile, Ala, per G Cleveland, jr, half, $147 50; R P Williams, St Louis, half, $2 50; a thankoffering from Trinity ch, Newport, R I, Rev R B Hall, rector, $15; St John's ch, Fort Hamilton, N Y, special offering of a friend at Easter, per Rev J D Carder, $10; an Easter offering, from H S H, Goshen, N Y, $5; offering of the Sunday school of St James's ch, Derby, Ct, per rector, $5 26; Easter offering of St Paul's ch, Troy, N Y, per Rev R B Van Kleeck, rector, of which $20 is for station at Racine, and $25 for Nashotah, $121 46. Total, $439 25.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
March 26, 1845. 139 Broadway, New York.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.—The Treasurer of the Foreign Committee since his report of the 12th inst, (2 weeks,) has received the following sums:

From Ladies' Missionary offerings of Christ ch, Middletown, Ct, per Rev H Hills, jr, $30; through Rev M T C Wing, R A, Gambier, O, from St Luke's ch, Granville, O, $4; Harcourt parish, Gambier, for China, $2; do, for Bp Southgate, $5; Christ ch, Huron, O, $1—$12; Mrs M S Turner, for Africa, $7; Ladies' Missionary Society of Trinity parish, Newton, Ct, for Africa, per Rev S S Stocking, $22; through Jonas Cutting, treasurer Missionary Association of St John's ch, Bangor, Me, from S school, 1st payment for education of J Wingate Carr, Africa, $20; from the church, for Foreign Missions generally, $18 22—$38 22; through W P Hunter, R A, Savannah, Ga, from Christ ch, St Simon's Island, $20; St John's ch, Stamford, Ct, half, $7 16; ladies of St Stephen's ch, N Y, for female beneficiary at Athens, $63; former subscribers for do, $17; from Miss Berrien, $80; R D, New York, for China, $5; Society for the Promotion of Christianity, Christ ch, Mobile, for Constantinople, $5; general purposes, $142 50—$147 50; R P Williams, St Louis, Mo, half, $2 50; S school St Bartholomew's ch, N Y, for education of Sophia Bartholomew, Africa, $20; 2d annual payment in advance from "Polk Missionary Society," Christ ch, Mobile, for education of Emma Alabama Jones, Africa, $20; Easter offerings, St Paul's ch, Troy, Rev Mr Van Kleeck, rector, for Houston, Texas, $20; for Galveston, $20; foreign missions generally, $39 46—$79 46; St John's ch, Fort Hamilton, N Y, part of Easter offerings, per Rev J D Carder, rector, $9 65; from Mrs Eliza Tracy and family of St George's ch, N Y, for the support of two Chinese children to be named Frederick Augustus Tracy, and Eliza Tracy, $50; through Rev E W Syle, J W P, Gorchland, Va, $5; Christ ch, Norfolk, Va, Female Missionary Band, $10; sundry persons, $28 50; St Paul's ch, Norfolk, $25; Bouton parish, Williamsburg, $12; sundry contributions for children, $1 52; F A M, $1 65—$84 17. Total, $634 66.

J. SMYTH ROGERS, Treasurer,
New York, March 26, 1845. 57 Wall-st.

NEW YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY.—The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, viz:—

From S Kellogg, of Walden, N Y, donation, $5; John T Fisher, annual, $2; Calvary ch, Rev S L Southard, rector, $25; Christ ch, Poughkeepsie, Rev John Reed, D D, rector, $60; Emmanuel church, Rev Francis Vinton, $2; Charles H Smith, annual subscriber, $5. Total amount, $99.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, March 26, 1845.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL TRACT SOCIETY.—The treasurer thankfully acknowledges the receipt of the following sums:—

From Susan L Kellogg, by her father, S Kellogg, to constitute her a life subscriber, $10; A T Canfield, annual, $1; Rev Joshua M Rogers, donation, $1; Emmanuel ch, Brooklyn, Rev Francis Vinton, rector, $2. Total amount, $14.

Donations and subscriptions thankfully received by
THOMAS C. BUTLER, Treasurer and Agent,
At the Depository, 20 John street.
New York, March 26, 1845.

MISSIONARY COMMITTEE OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK.—The Treasurer has received since report of 12th inst., the following contributions, viz:—

From Emmanuel ch, Little Falls, Rev E Livermore, rector, $7 50; Trinity ch, Athens, Rev T Mallaby, rector, $3 54; G C Verplanck, Esq, $30; Grace ch, New York, Rev Dr Taylor, rector, $210; Emmanuel ch, Brooklyn, Rev Francis Vinton, rector, $2—also, specially for Missionary at East end of Long Island, $34 25; Church of the Annunciation, New York, Rev Dr Seabury, rector, $46 59. Total amount, $333 88.

C. N. S. ROWLAND, Treasurer,
March 26, 1845. 55 Water street.

FUND FOR AGED AND INFIRM CLERGYMEN.—The Treasurer of the Convention has received for the "Fund for Aged and Infirm Clergymen," the following contributions since acknowledgment of 12th inst, viz:—

From Emmanuel ch, Little Falls, Rev E Livermore, rector, $7 50; Trinity ch, Athens, Rev T Mallaby, rector, $5 19. Total amount, $12 69.

C. N. S. ROWLAND, Treasurer
of the Convention of P. E. Church, N. Y.,
March 26, 1845. 55 Water street.

GERMAN CHURCH.—The Treasurer of St. Simon's Church gratefully acknowledges the receipt of the following sum, viz:

By Mr T C Butler, from Mrs Anna Watts, $25; by Rev Dr Cruse, from Rev Dr Muhlenberg, $40; from P G Stuyvesant, Esq, $10; collection in St Stephen's ch, $14; by T Cook, from Stewart Brown, Esq, $20; cash, $5. Total amount, $114.

JOHN A. VAN BLARCOM, Treasurer,
March 26, 1845. 290 Pearl street.

Donations for this object will b thankfully received, and may be left with Mr James A Sparks, at the office of the Churchman, 161 Fulton street; Stanford, & Swords, 139 Broadway; Mr T Cook, jr, 216 Houston street; or with the Treasurer.

WANTED to rent a large and commodious Room, suitable for a temporary place of worship; and so situated as not to encroach upon any of the principal churches in the city. Address "A. B." at the office of the Churchman, 161 Fulton street. March 29.

FAMILY BOOKS.—New and Important works designed especially for families.

1—The Pictorial Sunday Book. By John Kitto, D.D. A very handsome volume folio, with many hundred engravings.	$7 00
2—Old England, a Pictorial Museum of Regal, Ecclesiastical, Baronial, and Popular Antiquities. Vol. 1, large folio, with many hundred fine engravings.	7 00
3—The Pictorial Museum of Animated Nature. 2 vols. large folio, with many hundred fine engravings.	12 00
4—Pictorial History of England. 8 very large volumes with many hundred engravings.	27 00
5—Pictorial History of Palestine. 2 very large vols. with many hundred engravings.	8 00
6—Chambers's Cyclopœdia of English Literature. 2 large vols. 8vo.	6 00
7—Chambers's Information for the People. 2 large vols. 8vo.	6 00
8—Chambers's Tracts of Useful Information. Vol. 1, with engravings.	50

Imported and for sale by
M29. WILEY & PUTNAM, 161 Broaway.

ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL WORKS.—Just imported by D. APPLETON & Co., 200 Broadway.
The Teaching of the Prayer Book, &c. by J W Warter, B D, 8vo, $2 25.
The Symetry of Revelation a Witness to the Divinity of Christ—in three series of Advent Lectures, by R. C Coxe, M.A, 8vo, $3 25.
Sermons chiefly on the Interpretation of Scripture, by Thomas Arnold, D.D, 8vo, $3 75.
Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, by D Moore, M.A, 8vo, $1 25.
Sermons chiefly designed to show the Practical Working of Faith, by the Rev. F W Fowle, M.A, $2.
The Unity of the Church; a Sermon, with introductory remarks on Uniformity, by Archdeacon Julius Charles Hare, 8vo, $1.
The Year of Affections, or Affections on the Love of God's ——, from the Canticles for every day in the year, by Avrillon, translated, with an introduction by Dr. Pusey, 18mo, $2.
A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the books of the New Testament, explaining all the difficult places thereof, by H Hammond, D.D, new edition, 4 vols 8vo, Oxford press, $10.
Sermons on the Festivals, by the Rev. John Armstrong, B.A, 12mo. $2.
On Divine Service, the Sacraments, &c, by Richard Hooker, 18mo, 87½ cts.
Bishop Overhall's Convocation Book, new edition, 8vo, $2 50.
Bishop Andrewes Devotions, arranged a new, by Rev. J H Newman, 12mo, $1 50.
☞ Single copies of English Books imported to order.
March 29.

JUST IMPORTED.—A Reply to Strauss' Life of Jesus.

From the French of Quinet and Coquerel	$0 50
Strauss, Hegel, and their Opinions. By the Reverend J. Beard, D. D.	0 63
The Credibility of the Evangelical History Illustrated, with Reference to Strauss' Life of Jesus	0 50
The Theory of Mythus, in its Application to Gospel History, examined and confuted. By Dr. Julius Mueller	0 50
Illustrations of the Moral Argument for the Credibility of the Gospels. By the Reverend J. Beard, D. D.	1 00

Imported and for sale by
WILEY & PUTNAM,
March 22. 161 Broadway.

A LITERARY TREASURE—D. APPLETON & Co. have recently published the Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., by the Rev. A. P. Stanley, A. M. 1 vol. 12mo. 516 pages—$1 50.

"For a book of the most valuable miscellaneous information adapted to all professors in our colleges and seminaries, to all preceptors in the learned languages, to all students of every class in higher departments of education, and to all citizens engaged in the duties of the Gospel Ministry, or the practice of Medicine and Law, we know not any work which will convey so much luminous intelligence upon almost all the topics of literature adapted to the present era, as "The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold." A more accurate view may be obtained from this volume "of things without number," essential to be known by all literary persons, than from any other book to which we have access."—*Richmond Inquirer.*

Single copies of books imported to order by every steamer. March 29

WHAT OUGHT THE DIOCESE TO DO?

Considerations addressed to Churchmen of the Diocese of New York. By a Layman.

The excitement growing out of the conviction and sentence of our Bishop is at length beginning to subside; and as we recover from the shock occasioned by that event, and begin to contemplate the consequences resulting from it, the question, *What action, if any, ought our Diocese to take in the case?* forces itself upon the attention of every Churchman.

The practical answer we shall give to this question, involves such momentous consequences to the welfare of our Church, that it becomes us, not only to give it our most serious and dispassionate consideration, but to implore that divine guidance which alone can lead us in the path of true wisdom. The course we shall take, will go far to decide the practical worth and influence of the Church principles, for which our diocese has long been honorably distinguished. Thus far our path has been free from serious difficulties. Our Church has hitherto gone steadily on, strengthening and expanding itself—and so comparatively peaceful have been her courts, that numbers who heeded little her apostolic ministry and sacramental privileges, have gladly sought retreat within the hallowed precincts of her stable and well-ordered system, from the dissensions that raged around her. But times have changed: and we have now a sadder, but a not less imperative duty to perform, in showing forth the working of our principles in times of our trouble and humiliation: in showing, how we, who in times past have striven so earnestly and successfully to inculcate reverence and submission to constituted authority, will demean ourselves, when that authority has laid the heavy hand of discipline upon us. Our bearing and conduct in the present crisis will be looked to, not only by those without, but by numbers within our Church, as showing the legitimate operation of her principles, and may thus tell, for weal or for wo, upon her interests, long after we shall have been called from her visible communion.

The question which our course will determine, is of far greater magnitude than that, of how or by whom the episcopal functions shall, for a time, be administered in our diocese: it will determine whether our principles are to be relied upon in times of difficulty and peril; or whether they are only fair weather guides who disappear and desert us when storms and dangers thicken around us.

Divesting ourselves then, as much as we can, of all personal and party sympathies, it seems fitting, that we should look at the subject simply in reference to our duty as Churchmen, seeking only, with a reverent and filial spirit, to know and to do, that which duty to our spiritual mother demands at our hands.

Our first and most obvious duty in this respect, is to submit ourselves implicitly to her authority. To what good end are her tribunals appointed, if, when they have decided, each one of us is to raise his voice in approval or censure, alike presumptuous, of their decision. If such a spirit be subversive of good order and of the supremacy of law in civil society, much more is it inconsistent with the duty we owe to that divinely-appointed polity—that holy catholic Church of which we are members, and in which we are accustomed solemnly to profess our belief.

In view then of the case of our Bishop, we think that *for all purposes of ecclesiastical action* we have no judgment to form—no opinion to express. Our Church has not committed to us this duty, and we may well be thankful that so weighty a responsibility has been withheld from us. She has entrusted it to a tribunal which in her wisdom she deemed best fitted to discharge it. Whether that tribunal has judged rightly in the matter—whether it has so ministered discipline, as not to have forgotten mercy, it is not for us to say. It is and should be enough for us, that our Church through her appointed organ has spoken: and it is our part reverently to receive and submit to her judgment. But it has been said, that the publication of the proceedings, by the authority of the court, necessarily implied that we should examine and form our own judgments in relation to the case. If by this is meant, a judgment which is to form the basis of any ecclesiastical action, we cannot concur in this opinion. We cannot believe, that the publication of a case necessarily constitutes each one who may read it, a tribunal to re-judge the matter for himself. Whether upon the whole, it was expedient for so grave and venerable a tribunal to subject its proceedings and its solemn judgments to popular examination and discussion, was questioned by many of its wisest and purest members; but that it has seen fit to do so, can certainly take from its decision no whit of its binding force and obligation on the consciences of Churchmen, any more than the publicity of the proceedings of our civil courts and the regular publication of their judgments, detract from the respect and submission which they exact from every good citizen. As individuals, we may read the case and rightfully say, that we would or would not have come to the same conclusion as did the court, but in the discharge of all such duties as may devolve upon us in relation to the affairs of our Church, the case is decided for us—it is *res adjudicata*—and it is our duty to receive and faithfully carry out the decision, as one coming to us with the most solemn sanctions of the Church.

But some say they conscientiously believe that judgment to be an erroneous one, and our Bishop guiltless of the offences of which he has been convicted; and sincerely believing so, they cannot submit to seeing him wrongfully sacrificed. We answer, that our duty to the Church, to the maintenance of her lawful authority, is paramount to the claims of our suffering Bishop, and that even now in his affliction, it is not the least of his many claims upon the sympathy of Churchmen, that the great principle of respect and submission to authority ever found in him a fearless and efficient supporter. Be his condemnation right or wrong, the responsibility of it rests not upon us. Happily for us, it has been placed elsewhere, and where our Church has placed it, there let it remain. If it be a wrong judgment, God in his good providence can overrule all to the good of his suffering servants and the welfare of his Church. At all events, let us not be tempted aside from the path of our own duty, remembering always that to submit patiently, even to what we may think wrong, may not only be the bounden duty, but is often the best service a Christian can be called to perform. Earnestly then do we call upon all those who value the great conservative and catholic principles of our Church, to remember how much the cause of those principles may be jeoparded, by any inconsiderate or unworthy step on the part of those who profess them. Now is the time, when we may show with what reality we hold and with what faithfulness we can practise them—and how far our love and submission to them can exalt us above the influence of private sympathies and other special attachments; and thus perhaps, even in our sorrow and humiliation, we may be the humble instruments of bringing new strength and honor to our afflicted Church—and what we sow in tears we may yet reap in joy.

It may however be well to consider more explicitly, what we mean by submitting ourselves to the authority and judgment of our Church, and what is practically involved in so doing. We mean in the first place, that we should receive and carry out its judgment according to its fair scope and intent, and that too, from a spirit of Christian obedience merely, and without reference to our own notions of its propriety. To do otherwise—to carry it out so far only as it happens to coincide with our own views, is, as much as in us lies, to nullify it, and to fail in due support of its authority. It is for courts and similar bodies only to construe it in the light of the technical rules and limitations; but for us to seek to evade its broad, obvious meaning and effect, or by nice distinctions to cripple and limit its operation, is to manifest an unfilial and unsubmissive spirit, that needs only the power, to rise in open defiance and rebellion. This then we mean by submitting ourselves to the judgment of our Church,—that we should as a matter of conscience, receive and construe its decisions, when they conflict with our own judgment and wishes, in the same respectful and obedient spirit as if they met our approval.

Another thing implied in submission to our Church is, that we abstain from all uncharitable judgments and harsh censures of the motives and conduct of those who are set over us as spiritual fathers. Differing as many of us do, most widely from the theological views of some of the members of that right reverend body, let us remember, that if it is always a perilous thing for a Christian to judge the hearts of his fellow-men, much more so is it for him to impute corrupt or unworthy motives of official action to those whom his Church has placed in the highest and most solemn trusts. All the calamities which have befallen us would be light compared with the ruinous one of having public confidence in the integrity of our bench of bishops impaired.

But still the question recurs:—What shall we do? Shall we suffer our Diocese to remain indefinitely in its present state, deprived as it is of episcopal supervision and ministrations? We answer, that duty is ever before privilege. Important as we esteem them the privileges of which we are deprived, better, far better, would it be to remain as we are, than that in an effort to regain them, we should at once violate our own principles and assail the authority of our Church.

Much of the embarrassment which has attended this subject, results from indistinct conceptions of the nature and extent of our responsibility. It seems to be assumed that whenever an evil exists, the duty of endeavoring to remedy it is immediately imposed upon those who may be affected by it. Now there may be grievous evils which we may be called to endure, but for the existence and for the removal of which we are in nowise answerable: and such we think is the deprivation of episcopal services which our diocese now suffers. The responsibility of the sentence which has withdrawn these privileges from us, rests with the court, not with us—and it is quite as much as we can do to discharge the duties which God in his good providence has imposed upon us, without assuming the responsibility of those which have been committed to others. It may seem ruinous to the hopes and prosperity of the Church in our Diocese that things should continue as they now are. Be it so. We are not answerable for the consequences of events over which we have had no control. But we are answerable for our own conduct; and if these consequences were tenfold more disastrous than they are, it would be no reason why we should break through a single principle of duty to prevent them. No good is so important, and no evil so pernicious, as to warrant us in trampling down the intervening barriers of clear and well-ascertained principles in order to attain the one or avert the other. Let us only be content to do our own immediate duties in a right spirit, and we may trust that in good time a way of relief will be opened to us.

We have thus indicated the leading principles by which we think our course should be governed. It may now be proper to consider some of the specific modes of relief which have been proposed. One mode suggested is, that proper steps should be taken to bring about the restoration of the Bishop; the other, to obtain his resignation. To both of these propositions, *so far as they are to be the result of any action for the purpose, on the part of this Diocese*, there are grave objections.

As to the former proposition, the objections to it are manifold, and, we think, insurmountable. In the first place, the Bishop has never admitted his guilt, and so long as he maintains this attitude, unless the Church become satisfied that her judgment was erroneous and reverses it, he must be regarded in her sight as an impenitent offender. If he be conscious of no guilt, far be it from us to say that he ought to make such an admission: but we do say, that the Church cannot, without forfeiture of all claims to self-respect, restore one who refuses to acknowledge the justice of her decision. No true Churchman, whatever might be his regard for the Bishop, would wish to see him rise by the humiliation of the Church.

The Standing Committee of the Diocese, having come to the conclusion, in accordance with the very learned and able report made to them by a committee of their body, that the sentence of the Bishop is voidable by reason of its indeterminateness, a suggestion has been made, that, "should our next Diocesan Convention, by a strong vote declare the sentence null and void, there can be but little doubt that the declaration would be approved by the next General Convention." We hope no such measure will be proposed in our Diocesan Convention. It is not claimed that it has any judicial or legislative power to construe or modify the judgment of a court constituted and acting exclusively under the canons of the General Convention. Why then should it assume to declare its judgment of a case which does not properly come within its jurisdiction. Such a declaration, uttered two years in advance of the meeting of the body which it was intended to influence, would place us in the very questionable position of volunteering a solemn judgment in a case, where we were not prepared to assert our right to judge; and where at all events, we did not propose to act in accordance with our judgment when given. Powerless as it would be for any immediate good, it would not be so for evil. It would be regarded as an assumption on the part of our Diocesan Convention of powers which did not belong to it and inconsistent with the respect due to the court which pronounced the sentence, and to the General Convention, upon whom, in the absence of any other authorized body, it is presumed, the power of giving a construction in cases arising under its own canons, must devolve.

But our main objection to any step on the part of the Diocese to reinstate the Bishop is, that we believe the true interests of the Diocese will not permit it. We say this with unaffected reluctance. If we know our own heart, we would not willingly add a feather to the weight which is already pressing him to the very dust. Stricken and suffering as he is, it is as far from our duty as it is from our inclination, to utter a word which would swell the tide of condemnation against which he is struggling. In saying then, that we believe the interests of our Diocese will not permit us to make any effort for his restoration, we speak of a *fact* which we would fain doubt, if we could. Whatever we may individually think of the case, we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact of the generally unfavorable impression in relation to the Bishop which the trial and conviction have produced; and in considering what the welfare of our Diocese demands at our hands, we are bound, whatever may be our private opinion of the case, not to lose sight of so important an element, as the state of the public mind. The question whether we shall use our best efforts to save him from conviction, is one thing—the question whether, having been convicted, we should endeavor to restore to him his official functions, is another—a very different thing. It is our undoubted duty to any friend, and much more to one who to personal adds the highest official claims upon our regard and confidence—that we should do all in our power to save him from the consequences of charges which we believe unjust; but when our exertions have proved unavailing, it by no means follows, even if we adhere to our private opinion of his innocence, that we are called upon to take active measures to reinstate him in the office of which conviction has deprived him. However he may still stand in the eye of friendship, his position is essentially and irretrievably altered in the eye of the world. Be he in truth guilty or innocent, so long as his conviction remains *unreversed upon the merits* and by authority as high as that which pronounced it, he cannot bring back to the office that weight of character upon which his usefulness in it must depend. Public confidence is essential to the beneficial exercise of his official functions, and when this confidence has once been impaired, it is not easy to restore it. Indeed, if we mistake not the heart of the man, it would be little kindness to the Bishop himself to recal him to the exercise of his episcopal duties, if we could not bring back to him the old confidence and affection which in times past ever greeted his appearance among his people.

Under all the circumstances, is not the question of restoration then, so far as respects the propriety of our adopting positive measures to bring it about, the same as if it were one of original selection? Are we not bound in the same degree, to take into view the probable acceptableness of the candidate to the people over whom he is to preside; whether he has been discreet in his walk and conversation; whether rumor has been busy with his character; and finally all those other numberless circumstances which may affect his usefulness in the station to which he is to be called. We wish to be distinctly understood that we are speaking only of the propriety of positive action on *our* part in the matter; but we cannot see how we can consistently with our duty to the interests of our Diocese, call upon the authorities of the Church to restore powers to hands to which we could not have prudently advised them to commit them, if the commission were an original one.

As to the proposal that the Bishop should be requested by the Convention to resign, we think it objectionable upon the same grounds as some of the other propositions above referred to: namely, that it is calling upon the Convention to transcend the line of its duty. There is no little danger in these days, of forgetting that although the candidate for the episcopate is designated by diocesan election, his episcopal powers are not derived from, nor are they held at the mere pleasure of the Convention. In our desire to free ourselves from our present embarrassments we must not forget what is due to the episcopal office. Nor should the Convention for its own sake put itself in the position of claiming what it has no right to enforce. If the Bishop be conscious of guilt and yet persists, as he does, in asserting his innocence, we could hardly expect that such a man would make so great a personal sacrifice—one that must consign him to poverty and obscurity, out of mere regard to the welfare of his Diocese. If on the other hand, he be an innocent man, it is asking no slight thing to request him to aggravate his sentence by voluntarily adding the last and weightiest measure of severity, which even his judges saw fit to spare him.

It is not to be denied, that this voluntary resignation would under all circumstances, be highly desirable, as at once relieving the Diocese from the embarrassments of its present position. But it is a measure of relief, which must come, if it come at all, from the voluntary act of the Bishop himself. It must be for his judgment, to weigh all the considerations of the case, and for his conscience to determine whether the present state of things shall continue or whether they shall be terminated by such a personal sacrifice, on his part, for the good of his Diocese. One thing we may be permitted to say. To those who have hitherto sustained him, and whose confidence in him is still unimpaired, such an act would be additional assurance, that they had only deemed rightly of his disinterested and self-sacrificing devotion to the welfare of his Diocese. To those who have judged him more severely, it would at least show, that the spirit which could dictate such an offering to the peace of the Church, whatever may have been its frailties, must have been nourished by graces not of this world.

If we are right in the views we have thus submitted to the consideration of our fellow Churchmen, it would seem, that there is more danger of lasting prejudice to the interests of our Diocese, from our losing sight of the great principles which lie at the base of our whole Church system, than from a deprivation, which at worst can be but temporary, of our Episcopal privileges. We, therefore, submit, whether, if no resignation or other material change should take place, in relation to our Episcopate, before the meeting of our next Diocesan Convention, it would not be the best policy, for that body to restrict its action simply to making such provisions as are indispensable for the administration of the current business of the Diocese? Much as the present state of things is to be lamented, still, as we had no power to prevent, and have rightfully none to remedy, does it not indicate that our course is patiently to endure it: content to do the duty that is before us, under the disabilities to which we have been subjected, until those disabilities can be rightfully removed, whenever and however that may be.

One measure has been suggested, to which we perceive no objection. It is, that our Diocesan Convention which will be held in September, 1847, immediately previous to the meeting of the General Convention, should, in case no previous disposition of the matter is made, respectfully submit the whole matter to that body, as to a council of the Church, for its advice and for such remedial action in the premises, as in its wisdom it may deem the case to require.

We are aware how large a demand the course we have thus indicated will make upon our patience and self-denial. But we must bear in mind, that we are members of a body whose principles and objects are of no temporary character—that while the trials under which we labor, are of necessity but for a season, and may be terminated, in some unforseen way, at any moment, should such be the will of Providence; any inconsiderate step, any departure from duty or sound principle, may be a lasting blow to that catholic and apostolic Church which hath nurtured us in her bosom and has the best claims to our love and reverence, and if need be, to our services also. Whatever claims others may have upon us, our allegiance to her is paramount. Ever watchful should we be, to guard her interests—to serve her in such way, as to her, not to ourselves, may seem best—mindful, too, that the best services are not always active ones, and that

> "God doth not need
> Either man's work, or his own gifts; who best
> Bear his mild yoke, they serve him best; his state
> Is kingly; thousands at his bidding speed,
> And post o'er land and ocean without rest;
> They also serve, who only stand and wait."

ST. MARY'S HALL.

In approaching the close of the eighth year of this Institution, the Bishop of New Jersey acknowledges with gratitude the blessing from the Lord which crown his labors in its behalf. The term now current, for the first time, finds the building filled. Not to reject, at the next term, many of the numerous applications now received, an enlargement of the buildings will be necessary. This will be done without delay, in good time for the opening of the term; to the great improvement, as well as increase, of the present accommodations of the House. To meet the increased responsibility of greater numbers, and to give the fullest pledge of his devotion to a work, which has gained constantly upon his heart, and which is scarcely second in importance, to the Church and country, to any thing which he can do, the Bishop, on the first day of May, will go into St. Mary's Hall, as Rector, to take an important part in its instruction, as well as in its oversight and government. The Rev. Mr. Germain will continue to be the Chaplain and Head of the Family; and Mrs. Bishop, as heretofore, will be the Matron. Important improvements, in every department, will be made: and nothing spared, that faithful labors or that fervent prayers can do, to make it most effectual, with His blessing, as a nursery of the Church, to train up Christian women.

The regular course of instruction at St. Mary's Hall will include a Primary Department, and a Junior, a Middle, and a Senior Class. The studies of each of the three classes will occupy one year. Applicants will be admitted into the Primary Department, without examination, and at any age. Admission into any of the Classes will be granted to such only as sustain an examination on the studies which precede it. Those who complete the whole course, satisfactorily to the direction of the Institution, will receive, at its close, a testimonial to that effect.

The year is divided into two terms and two vacations. The Summer Term commences on the first day of May, and the Winter Term on the first day of November. The months of April and October are the vacations. Whole expense, for the term of five months, including every charge, except for Sheet Music, and drawing and painting materials $135, payable always in advance. The charge for each Vacation, to those who remain at the Hall, will be $10. No bill of any kind, to be contracted by, or for, the pupils.

Addresss the Rev. R. J. Germain, Chaplain, and Head of the Family, St. Mary's Hall, Burlington, New Jersey; to whom the earliest application should be made, to secure admission for the ensuing term.

Burlington, N. J., March 22, 1845—tM10.

FRENCH AND ENGLISH SCHOOL FOR YOUNG LADIES.

THE Rev. C. H. Williamson, (pastor of the Second French Episcopal congregation in New York,) and Lady, desire to inform their friends that they have removed their School to 72 Murray street.

This School has been in successful operation for the last seven years, and has satisfactorily proved that, by an interesting and easy method, the youngest pupils speak the French language in a most pleasing manner.

A separate class is open for very young boys.

Terms.—Tuition in French, English, Singing, Drawing, Work, &c.—For the first class, $15; for the second, $12 50; for the third, $10. No extra charge ever made, except for fuel.

☞ A deduction of $2 50 on each class, per term, if paid in advance. The term consists of eleven weeks. April 6, 1844.—yly

---

SELECT BOARDING SCHOOL FOR BOYS, at Tarrytown, Westchester County New York.—William W. Weston, A. M., Principal.

In this Institution pupils are afforded the means of a thorough course of instruction in all the branches of an English and Classical Education, preparatory to college or commercial pursuits. It is strictly a family school, in which the pupils, being limited in number, are, as far as practicable, regarded and treated, in every respect, as children of the Principal, and are constantly under his own personal care and instruction.

The location is highly eligible. Tarrytown is justly celebrated for its beautiful and romantic scenery, the perfect salubrity of its climate, and the elevated character of its citizens. It is twenty-seven miles from New York, and is visited every morning and evening by steamboats from the city.

The school is about one mile from the landing, and half a mile from the village, thus enjoying the advantages of perfect retirement, and ample grounds for exercise and recreation.

The Summer Term Commences on the First Wednesday in May.

Terms.—For board, washing, mending, fuel, lights, and instruction in all the ordinary English branches, the higher Mathematics, and the Latin and Greek Languages, $75 per term, payable in advance. Circulars at the bookstores of Messrs. Stanford & Swords, 139 Broadway; Messrs. Raynor, Bowery; Messrs. Appleton & Co., 200 Broadway.

References.—Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, Rev. C. D. Jackson, Rev. Geo. D. Sutton, W. Parker, M. D., C. R. Gilman, M. D., Stephen B. Tompktns, Esq., J. C. Baldwin, Esq., New York City. Rev. Dr. Creighton, S. Swartwout, Esq., N. B. Holmes, Esq., N. Bayles, Esq., Tarrytown. Feb. 22—tJune 1. $

ORGAN BUILDING.—Mr. Jardine, Organ Builder, of New York, has just completed and put up in the Roman Catholic Church of Norfolk, Va., a large and superior Instrument of his manufacture. It surpasses my expectation in its compass, melody and decorations. In bearing cheerful testimony to his beautiful fabric, I am happy to add that I have derived unmixed pleasure from my intercourse, official and social, with the meritorious artist.

A. L. Hilselberger,
Pastor of St. Patrick's R. C. Church, Norfolk.

Feb. 19, 1845.

It affords us much pleasure in adding our testimony to the above.

P. H. Masi, Organist of the Church.
W. D. Delany, Mayor of Norfolk.
B. M. Miller, Rector of St. Paul's Ch. Do.
W. Southgate, Cashier Exch. Bank of Va.
P. P. Mayo, Attorney at Law, &c. &c.

The above Instrument contains 21 Stops, 2 sets of Manuals and Pedal Bass to CCC 16 feet.

To clergymen and gentlemen about furnishing their Churches with organs, Mr. Jardine respectfully solicits their orders. March 1

JUST received from England, and for sale at the Church Depository, No. 20 John street.

The Liturgy Compared with the Bible; or, an Illustration and Confirmation by Scripture Quotations and References of such parts of the Book of Common Prayer, Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland as are not direct extracts from the Holy Scriptures.

Learn to Live, and Learn to Die. By Christopher Sutton, D.D., in one volume, fine calf.

The True Church of Englandman's Companion in the Closet; or, a Complete Manual of Private Devotions; collected from the writings of Archbishop Laud, Bishops Andrewes and Ken, Dr. Hicks, Mr. Kettlewell and Mr. Spinckes—fine calf.

Church Poetry; or, Christian Thoughts in Old and Modern Verse.

The Child's Christian Year,—Hymns for every Sunday and Holydays.

Also, a variety of Books for Children, from the press of Burns, London. March 8—3t

---

VALUABLE NEW WORKS—1. Eothen; or, Traces of Travel brought home from the East. 1 vol., beautifully printed. $0 50.

2. Mary Schweidler, the Amber Witch. A Trial for Witchcraft. 1 vol., beautifully printed. $0 38.

3. Human Magnetism; its claims to disppassionate Inquiry, &c. By W. Newnham. 1 vol. $1 00.

4 Correspondence between Schiller and Goethe. Translated by G. H. Calvert. 1 vol. $1 00.

5. A Course of English Reading. By the Rev. J. Pycroft. 1 vol. 12mo. $0 75.

6 Rome in 1843 & 1844, as seen by a New Yorker. 1 vol. 12mo. $0 75.

7. Anastasis; or, the Doctrine of the Resurrection. By Professor Bush. Second edition. $1 00.

8. Hydropathy; or, the Water Cure. By Joel Shew, M. D. Second edition. $1 00.

Published and for sale by
March 22. WILEY & PUTNAM, 161 Broadway.

COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE,

Tompkinsville, Staten Island.

Rev. THOMAS TOWELL, A. M., Principal.

PARENTS who have children to be educated, are respectfully invited to visit this Institution, and they will find that, as to situation and advantages, it cannot be surpassed by any on the Island.

The course of instruction comprises the *English* in all its branches, Latin, Greek, French, Italian, Spanish and German.

The Principal, who has been educated in Trinity College, (Dublin,) and has taught for several years in this country, takes charge of the Classical Department.

The English Department is attended to by a gentleman from one of the most celebrated Academies in the State who is both experienced and competent.

The French, Spanish, Italian, and German are taught by a Parisian, a graduate of the College Royal de Louis-le-grand, and a person of high literary attainments.

No Teachers are engaged but such as are fully qualified and possess withal established *Christian principles.*

TERMS.—Board (including washing) and Tuition, in a full English course, together with the languages, if desired, per annum, payable quarterly, and in *advance*, $200.

N. B.—Each Pupil must be furnished with a Bible and Prayer Book, if he belong to the Episcopal Church, which is most convenient, Bed, Bedding, Towels and Napkins.

☞ Persons wishing to visit the School, will be directed from the Planter's Hotel.

REFERENCES.

New York.—Rt. Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D. D., Rev. W. Berrian, D. D., Rev. Prof. Charles Hackley, D. D., Rev. W. Morris, Rector of Trinity School, and Rev. W. Walter.

Western New York.—Rt. Rev. W. H. De Lancey, Rev. B. Hale, D.D., Pres. Geneva College, Rev. P. A. Proal, D.D., Rector of ——, Utica, and L. Bush, D.D.

Laity.—Levi Cook, 138 Pearl street; W. H. Townsend, corner of Nassau and Wall streets; James C. Parker, 53 Merchant's Exchange, and W. B. Townsend, Express Buildings. June 22.

FAMILY SCHOOL FOR BOYS.

New Hartford, Oneida County, N. Y.

THE undersigned, having removed to the spacious mansion of the late Judge Sanger at New Hartford, is now prepared to receive into his family a limited number of pupils.

The course of instruction embraces the Classics, Mathematics, and Modern Languages; and will prepare the student for College, or for active business. Vocal and instrumental music will be taught when desired.

The government shall be strictly parental.

The religious instruction of the family is under the general supervision of the Rector of the Parish. The academic year consists of two terms of twenty-two weeks each, commencing on the first Wednesday in June and November.

The expense for Tuition in all the branches of study, including Board, Washing, Books, Stationery, Drawing materials, &c. is $175 per annum. Without tuition in Music, Drawing, and the Modern Languages, the charge is $130 per annum.

References.—The Right Rev. W. H. De Lancey, Bishop of the Diocese of Western N. York; the Rev. J. C. Rudd, D. D., the Rev. P. A. Proal, D. D., the Rev. George Leeds, Utica; the Rev. Wm. E. Eigenbrodt, New Hartford.

June 29—yly W. H. PADDOCK.

CHURCH AND PARLOR ORGANS.

WM. P. GARDNER, Organ Builder, No. 12 State street, New Haven, manufactures all sizes and prices of Church and Parlor Organs, with all the latest improvements in rich mahogany, rosewood and painted cases, with swells and pedals for shifting movement for the stops. Prices from $150 to $500. These instruments have been greatly admired for their brilliancy and sweetness of tone, also their fine workmanship, by all that have seen and heard them.

Also, a class of Church Organs of great volume and sweetness of tone, built for small churches, in rich Gothic and other cases, with swell, pedals, &c., from $300 to $1,000.

Also, Church Organs with two sets of keys, with great power and sweetness, with swell, composition pedals and pedal base, for $1,000 to $4,000.

All instruments will be warranted of the best materials and workmanship. Societies will do well by giving him a call before purchasing elsewhere, as they can obtain a larger Organ for the price than at any other establishment.

Superior Seraphines, for young beginners, from $50 to $75. Organs and all kinds of instruments tuned and repaired; also packed and sent to any part of the country at the lowest prices.

⁂ Orders may be left with, or inquiries made of
JAMES A. SPARKS,
Feb. 10. 161 Fulton street, New York.

ORGANS.—The subscriber offers for sale the following Organs, viz:

One of 10 stops, Grecian case, 12 feet 6 inches high, 8 feet 6 inches wide, and 7 feet deep. Compass of keys from GG to F Alt. One octave of Pedal pipes.

One of 8 stops, 11 feet high, 7 feet 3 inches wide, and 4 feet 6 inches deep. Compass of keys from GG to F Alt.

Two of 6 stops, 10 feet 6 inches high, 6 feet 6 inches wide, and 4 feet deep. Compass of keys from GG to F Alt.

Two of 5 stops, 9 feet 5 inches high, 6 feet wide, and 3 feet 9 inches deep. Compass of keys from CC to F Alt.

Three of 4 stops, 8 feet 6 inches high, 5 feet 6 inches wide, and 3 feet deep. Compass of keys from CC to F Alt.

Six of 3 stops, 7 feet 6 inches high, 5 feet 4 inches wide, and 2 feet 6 inches deep. Compass of keys from CC to F Alt.

Also two elegant parlor organs, in Mahogany polished cases.

Also a dumb organ. This is a piece of Machinery that can be attached to, or removed from, the keys of any organ without difficulty. They are operated on by a Crank, similar to a Barrel Organ, and can be made to play any music required.

HENRY ERBEN,
Sept. 7. Centre street, head of Canal st.

ORGAN BUILDING.—THOMAS HALL, (formerly of Philadelphia, and more recently of the firm of Hall & Erben,) Church and Parlor Organ Builder, informs his friends and the public, that he is prepared to execute orders for ORGANS of every description, at his Manufactory, No. 86 Wooster street, near Spring, at short notice, and at reduced prices.

From the long experience the subscriber has had in the business of Organ building, he flatters himself he can furnish instruments of a quality at least equal to he productions of any other builders in the United States. Orders for Tuning and Repairing punctually attended to.

THOMAS HALL,
No. 80 and 86 Wooster street,
Dec. 9—yly. near Spring.

TRINITY CHURCH CEMETERY, near Manhattanville, being now fenced in the most permanent and secure manner, with a keeper constantly on the grounds, is open for the interment of the dead of all denominations, in single graves or church vaults. A large proportion of the grounds has been laid out in private burial and vault lots, which are all fronted on avenues. A choice of which can now be made by persons wishing to secure them. The prices for the same, as well as for single interments, have been fixed very low. Undertakers or Sextons of any Church, can procure permits for interments, by applying to J. Morrison, at the Vestry office, corner of Fulton and Church streets, from 9 A. M., to 3 P. M., and after that hour at 17 Clarkson street. The use of the chapel and receiving tomb, in Clarkson street, will be granted, if desired, without any charge except the Sexton's, for opening, which is $1.

The soil is very dry and light, and is particularly well suited for burial purposes. A large room in the keeper's lodge is fitted up and warmed for the use of persons useing or visiting the Cemetery. The Manhattanville line of stages leaves the corner of Chatham street and Tryon Row (Hall of Records) every hour, and conveys passengers to or from the Cemetery for 18 3-4 cts each. It is expected that steamboats will land passengers or funerals at the Cemetery pier the ensuing season twice a day, fare 12½ cts. Information as to the price of Burial Plots, &c., can be had at the Vestry Office, corner of Fulton and Church streets, or at No. 261 Broadway, corner of Warren street.

November 9—tf

A REPLY to the Speech of Rev. F. L. Hawks, D. D., which he delivered in Philadelphia, October 11th, 1844, before the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church. By James Quarterman, House and Sign Painter.

Also the Protest as presented to the above Convention. Reply 12½ cents.—Protest 12½ cents.

For sale at this office. Feb. 8—10t$

LONDON BOOKS.—Just received per ship Victoria,

The Liturgy compared with the Bible.
The Church from January to December.
Promesi Sposi, 2 vols.——The Abbey Church.
Poole's England, vol. 1.
Wilberforce's Sermons. Do. American Church.
Surin's Spiritual Life. Dr. Pusey's ed.
Avrillon's Guide to Advent, do. &c.

J. A. SPARKS, Churchman's Bookstore,
Feb. 15. 161 Fulton street.

JAMES A. SPARKS,

No. 161 Fulton street, New York.

BEGS leave to offer his services to Clergymen and others at a distance from the New York Book Market, to purchase books for them on the most reasonable terms, and to forward them as may be directed, to any part of the United States, or Canada.

Orders, enclosing cash, for any book in this market, or for Sunday School Libraries, will be promptly attended to.

J. A. S. would refer to the Right Rev. the Bishop of New York; the Right Rev. Bishop Chase, of Illinois, he Rev. Messrs. D. S. Lewis, St. Francisville, La.; W. D. Cairns, Columbus, Ga.; J. A. M'Kenney, Cambridge, Md.; Rev. John Coleman, D. D., Editor of the Banner of the Cross, Philadelphia; Rev. Wm. Henry Hoit, St. Albans, Vermont; Rev. M. P. Parks, Chaplain of the U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.; J. S. F. Heald, Esq., Darien, Ga.; Rev. J. Singletary, Washington, N. C.; B. W. Fosdick, Esq., Savannah, Georgia.

J. A. S. is Agent for the following Church Works: The Banner of the Cross, weekly, price $2 50 in advance. The True Catholic, monthly, price $2 50 in advance. A View of the Organization and Orders of the Primitive Church, by Rev. A. B. Chapin, A.M., price $1 50. Jan. 25.

To the Maryland Clergy.—Books and Stationery.

H. COLBURN, Bookseller and Stationer, No. 216 Baltimore street, Baltimore, keeps constantly on hand a good and general assortment of Books and Stationery at New York and Philadelphia prices. His assortment embraces Theological Medical, School, and Miscellaneous Books.

All the leading Church publications, including those of the Sunday School Union, may be had at the lowest prices; and he respectfully appeals to the Clergy of the Church, not only for their own custom, but to recommend their friends who may be coming to the city to give him a call. Dec. 7.

Church Cushions, Pulpit Furniture, &c.

THE subscribers would respectfully inform Building Committees and members of churches that they are prepared to execute orders for Cushions, Lining and Stuffing of Pews, Benches, and making of Furniture for and Trimming of Pulpits and Desks, of every kind of material used for the purpose, of different styles, at moderate prices, and at the shortest notice.

W. & G. CURTIS, Upholsterers in general,
Aug. 3—tf No. 52 Maiden Lane.

THE AMERICAN HARP.—A Collection of new and original Church Music, under the control of the Musical Professional Society in Boston, arranged and composed by Ch. Zeuner, organist to St. Paul's Church and to the Handel and Haydn Society.

Extract from recommendation of Musical Society.

"Having our profession at heart, we trust Mr. Zenner's work will have an extensive circulation, convinced that it will give satisfaction not only to the profession itself, but also to the liberal amateur, and to any congregation where music forms a part of worship."

Feb. 15—3m ALEX. V. BLAKE, 77 Fulton st.

Just Published.

By the General Prot. Episcopal S. S. Union.

THE SHADOW OF THE CROSS; *An Allegory.* By the Rev. W. Adams, M. A. From the London edition, with elegant Illustrations from original designs by Chapman.

The Distant Hills—*An Allegory.* By the same author, and similarly illustrated.

Sacred Allegories.—*The Shadow of the Cross* and *The Distant Hills* in one volume, with a beautifully engraved title.

The History of Our Blessed Lord. *In Easy Rhyme*; with six beautiful lithographic illustrations, and other designs.

Edward Trueman, *or False Impressions.*

Susan Harvey—*Confirmation.*

For sale at the Depository, 20 John st.

Dec. 28—tf

PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY

THE GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION, Depository, No. 20 John street, New York.

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

Union Primer,	per hundred	$3 00
Prot. Epis. Sunday School Book, No. 1,	"	1 38
" " " No. 2,	"	1 75
" " " No. 3,	"	2 00
" " " No. 4,	"	5 00
Questions on the Sunday School Books,	"	5 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism,)	"	1 38
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	"	2 50
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,	"	5 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	"	3 00
Church Catechism,	"	1 25
First Truths,	"	2 50
Duty to God,	"	0 50
Church Primer,	"	1 38
Sunday School Liturgy and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children	"	1 75
Harmony of the Creeds	"	2 25
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	"	2 25
Collects from the Prayer Book	"	2 00
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	"	10 00
Catechism on the Collects	"	25 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	"	8 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, parts 1 and 2, stiff covers	"	10 00
Bible Companion, Vol. 1, Old Testament,	"	20 00
" " Vol. 2, New "	"	22 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff covers,	"	10 00
" " 2, "	"	9 00
" " 3, "	"	10 00
Questions on The Acts, 1, "	"	10 00
" " 2, "	"	9 00
" " 3, "	"	8 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child,	"	2 50
Beavens' Help to Catechising	"	10 00

☞ A discount of ten per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

The Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Library, 80 vols. 18mo.—nett price 20 cents each.

The same, bound in 147 volumes of various prices. Total, $20 18 nett.

The Children's Magazine, bound in 30 volumes of 144 pages each, price for the set, $6 21 nett.

The Juvenile Library, 6 vols. 32mo.—price for the set, 85 cents nett.

☞ Address all orders for Books, and all remittances, to DANIEL DANA, Agent,
Church Depository, 20 John street.
New York, April 6, 1844.

Agents for the Churchman.

Portsmouth, N H—Rev Charles Burroughs, D. D. and George M Marsh.
Burlington, Vt—N A Tucker, Esq.
Middlebury, Vt—Harmon A Sheldon.
Boston, Mass—Charles Stimpson.
Providence, R I—Samuel C Blodget, bookseller.
Pawtucket, R I—David Le Favour.
St Albans, Vt—G G Smith.
Quincy, Florida—Rev Josiah Perry.
New Haven, Ct—Croswell & Jewett, booksellers.
Hartford, Ct—Henry S Parsons.
Philadelphia, Pa—George & Wayne, bookseller.
Albany, N Y—W C Little, Esq.
Catskill, N Y—Charles B Pinckney.
Saratoga Springs, N Y—Stephen B Nash, Esq.
Schenectady, N Y—A A Van Voorst.
Troy, N Y—Young & Hartt.
West Troy, N Y—George H Lewis.
Lansingburgh, N Y—Alex. Walsh, Esq. (gratis.)
Poughkeepsie, N Y—Ebenezer C Arnold.
Hudson, N Y—Milo B. Root.
Newburgh, N Y—William Purdy.
Auburn, N Y—Thomas C Miller.
Geneva, N Y—George M Hills.
Utica, N Y—Isaiah Tiffany.
Watertown, N Y—J F Hutchinson, Esq., P. M.
Unadilla, N Y—A B Watson.
Oswego, N Y—Henry Adriance.
Buffalo, N Y—W B & C E Peck, booksellers.
Fayetteville, N Y—D L Farnham, Esq.
Newcastle, Delaware—Hon. James Booth.
Baltimore, Md—H Colburn.
Chaptico, Md—J Biscoe, Post Office.
Princess Ann, Md—Wm W Johnston, Esq., P. M.
Alexandria, D C—Bell & Entwistle.
Norfolk, Va—George Rowland, Esq.
Richmond, Va—Joseph Gill.
Wilmington, N C—A A Brown, Esq.
Charleston, S C—A E Miller.
Augusta, Georgia—G McLaughlin.
Louisville, Ky—Solomon K Grant.
Lexington, Ky—William Iucho.
Marietta, Ohio—Arius Nye.
Cleveland, Ohio—Lewis Handerson.
Quincy, Illinois—Henry H Hoffman, Post Office
Chicago, Illinois—John H Kenzie, Esq.
Jackson, Michigan—P E Demill, Esq.
Homer, Michigan—Rev E O Hodgkin.
St. Louis, Missouri—R P Williams.
Natchez, Miss—Brevoort Butler.
Mobile, Ala—S. W. Raymond, and J. M. Conley.
Halifax, N S—Joseph H Graham, bookseller.